





SIXTH

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

WITH THE

S P E E C H E S

DELIVERED AT THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING

HELD IN THE CITY OF NEW-YORK,

On the 7th of May, 1839.

AND THE

MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE SOCIETY FOR BUSINESS,

HELD ON THE

EVENING AND THE THREE FOLLOWING DAYS.

NEW-YORK:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM S. DORR,
No. 123 Fulton Street.
1839.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY

OF THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Sixth Anniversary of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY was held in the Broadway Tabernacle on Tuesday, May 7, 1839.

ARTHUR TAPPAN, the President of the Society, took the chair at 10 o'clock, A. M.

The Rev. GEORGE ALLEN, of Shrewsbury, Mass., read selected portions of Scripture.

The Rev. CYRUS P. GROSVENOR, of Worcester, Mass., addressed the throne of grace.

An Abstract of the Annual Report of the Executive Committee was read by ELIJAH WRIGHT, Jr., one of the Secretaries of the Society.

The acceptance and publication of the Report was moved by GERRIT SMITH, of Peterboro'; and seconded by the Rev. JOHN RANKIN, of Ripley, Ohio.

Mr. SMITH, in moving the acceptance and printing of the Report, expressed his hope that when printed, the Report, with all the important statements and convincing arguments it contained, might reach every portion of our country. God, he said, would bless these truths, and would give them efficacy on the minds of men, in spite of all the spurious religion and spurious republicanism which curse our land.

Mr. RANKIN said he had been brought up in the midst of slavery, and now lives on the borders of a free State, where he was every hour looking over upon the land of oppression. All my life, said he, except seventeen years, has been spent in the slave States, and no person has more kindly feelings towards the slaveholding States than myself. There my friends and kindred dwell. I

speak the language of kindness, and would do the utmost in my power to persuade them to put away an evil which threatens their destruction. I must say I rejoice in the triumph of the principles of immediate emancipation, because I know, from long observation, it is the only thing that can relieve both master and slave from inevitable ruin. The system of slaveholding is calculated to bring ruin upon the country where it is tolerated ; and I speak the language of the South, when they speak candidly. I was a member of an Anti-Slavery Society in Kentucky, twenty years ago, on the same principle as this. The doctrine of immediate emancipation is said to be new ; but societies were formed all over the country, twenty years ago, and many members of these societies advocated this same doctrine. The slaveholders confessed that it was a system that would bring ruin upon the country ; but, when asked why they did not abolish it, they would say, like Hezekiah of old, "It will not come now—we shall have peace in our day." Others said they believed, *with the assistance of the free States*, they could hold them forever. Yet we are told, the free States have nothing to do with the subject. Slaveholders have told me, if separated from the free States, they would be in the hands of the slaves entirely.

We feel the hand of oppression not only upon the slave, but upon ourselves. Where I live, my soul is harrowed continually with the cruelties committed in sight of my house, where slavery exists in its mildest form. There, slavery has sometimes caused our town to go in mourning. [Here he related the case of the slave ferryman, who was suddenly and without warning or preparation, sold for \$750, by his master, to go "down the river," after having agreed to set him free, and the money had been raised for the purpose, because an opportunity of getting \$200 more, so that he was separated from his wife and children. The details of the case have been already published.] While I continue to be a husband and father, I must stand up and protest against this evil.

Laws have lately been passed in Ohio, imposing a fine of \$500, or imprisonment, on any person who shall knowingly assist a slave to escape. There was an aged mother who had been brought up in the Presbyterian church, and who sustained an unblemished Christian character for twenty years, who fell into the hands of heirs, who, it is said, wished to liberate her, but the guardians were determined to sell her, old as she was, into the cruel slavery of the South. She was obliged to fly. Now, suppose this sister in the church had come to me, and I had assisted her to flee from her cruel persecutors, the State would have fined me \$500 or sent me to prison. Yet I, as a minister of Christ, should only have been doing what is enjoined by the gospel I preach. I am forbidden to do an act of charity—I am commanded to do the very thing which the Bible forbids me to do—to deliver the fugitive servant to his master. I should be bound to take this sister into my house, if she comes there ; and yet such is the effrontery of slavery, that they have come over and demanded that we, who assist our brethren, according to the requisitions of God's word, shall suffer bonds and imprisonment. I cannot, therefore, but rejoice in the success of this Society ; and it shall have my prayers day and night.

The Rev. LUTHER LEE, of Utica, N. Y., offered the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the system of American slavery usurps the prerogatives of God, tends to blot the divine image from the soul of man, degrades him from the dignified rank his Maker gave him in the scale of creation, and subverts all the social relations which God and nature have made essential to his earthly enjoyment."

Mr. President, were I to attempt to give a brief but comprehensive view of the sinfulness of slavery, I would do it in the words of St. Paul to Bar-Jesus.

“Thou full of all subtilty and mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?” and then I would answer the question in a thrilling and emphatic NO, that would make every heart feel that slavery, bad as it is, can be made no better. I have it not in my heart, so much to undervalue the intelligence, moral sense, and humanity of this assembly, as to suppose that they are pro-slavery in judgment, in heart, and in feeling, yet as there is a vast difference between believing that slavery is wrong, and seeing and feeling how great a wrong it is, I trust it will not be considered a breach of charity to suppose that there may be many, now within the sound of my voice, who have never considered the magnitude of this great sin. I wish then to be understood, as not making the present effort, so much to convince you that slavery is wrong, as to cause you to see and feel the greatness of the wrong, that in its guilt it rises to heaven, and in its corruption it sinks to hell.

The resolution, which I have had the honor of presenting, lays four distinct crimes to the charge of slavery, which I will attempt briefly to sustain.

I. The resolution charges slavery with usurping the prerogatives of God. To be convinced of this, I need only compare the requisitions which God makes upon his creatures with the assumptions of slavery. The divine requisition is summed up in the first and great commandment, in these words: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy might.” Now, nothing can be plainer than that slavery usurps what God has here reserved to himself when it says: “A slave is one who is in the power of a master, to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry and his labor: he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing but what must belong to his master.”—*Louisiana Civil Code, Art. 35.* Here it is seen that slavery sets up a claim to man which contravenes the claim of God, it seizes upon the subjects of God’s moral government, and wrests them from his administration, and subjects them to the will of a despot, who is not satisfied with trampling upon the rights of man, but who arrogantly attempts to wrest the reins of government from him whose throne is in the heavens. The claim of slavery equals the claim of God, it claims the whole man, and asserts its absolute right to the whole soul and body, mind and muscle, all that the man is, all that he can do, all he can possess, and all that he can acquire, and what more than this can God claim? Have these human chattels souls that must be forever saved or lost? and can they do nothing in the work of saving or damning their souls, but what must belong to their masters? Suppose they obey God, so far as circumstances will permit, and through Jesus Christ acquire eternal life, will that belong to the master? and will he appear at the judgment seat and claim the crown by virtue of his title to the slave, who “can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing but what must belong to his master?” Or suppose the slave to be as wicked as his master, and to live and die a child of the devil, and an heir of hell, will the master appear and take the wages of sin as his own? It may be said that nothing is meant more than that slaves can do, possess and acquire nothing of a temporal nature but what must belong to their masters. I know this is what is meant, but I know with equal certainty, that man’s future destiny depends upon what he does and possesses in this life. Christ represents himself as saying at the last day, “Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world, for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat, naked and ye clothed me, sick and ye visited me, in prison and ye came unto me. Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren ye have done it unto me.” And again he says, “Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels, for I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat, I was thirsty

and ye gave me no drink, I was a stranger and ye took me not in, naked and ye clothed me not, sick and in prison and ye visited me not. Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me."

Now, I ask, can those who can do nothing but what must belong to another, visit the sick and those in prison? Can those who can possess nothing, and acquire nothing, but what must belong to another, feed the hungry and clothe the naked? You all know they cannot, and hence, you see that slavery disqualifies men for subjects of God's moral government,—it denies them the means of complying with the first precepts of the gospel,—it therefore contravenes the claims of God, and sets at nought the great law of our being, which holds all intelligent creatures in allegiance to the throne of the Creator. If this is not high treason against the government of God, treason is a nonentity. If it is not trespass upon the prerogatives of God, it can never be proved that the devil has committed trespass in the case of all the souls he has seduced from their allegiance to the divine throne, for he never claimed more of man than slavery claims, and never received more from the most accomplished and zealous fiend that ever served his cause, disembodied or incarnate; no, not on the black throne of hell, wielding a sceptre of unmingled despotism—over unblest ghosts whose ruined immortality exerts its perverted energies under cover of that dark night of despair that mantles the damned. How great a sin is slavery? It is the sum of all sin, it is a monopoly of crime! For a worm of earth, a man, to attempt to throw off his own allegiance to his Maker is an awful thought; but awful as it is, it is as much below the crime of slavery, as he who would simply expatriate himself from his government, is less chargeable with treason, than he who, instead of expatriating himself, should attempt to expel his sovereign for the purpose of seizing the throne himself. The common sin of refusing to obey is outdone and lost in the blacker shades of the slaveholder's guilt, who not only refuses to obey himself, but refuses to let others obey, seizing upon the subjects of God's moral government, and, usurper-like, attempts to reign in the place of the Almighty. It must be seen from this, that slavery usurps the prerogatives of God, and that so far as slavery prevails, the government of God is blotted from the world.

II. Slavery is charged in the resolution with a tendency to blot the divine image from the soul of man.

So far as the image of God, in which man was created, consisted in the rectitude of his character as a moral being, I shall not now discuss the subject, for so far the divine image must be lost before slavery could exist; for none but fallen and depraved beings would ever be found in the relation of master and slave. To know what constituted the image of God, in which man was made, we need only inquire what distinguished him from the lower creatures; for it appears to me that whatever the image was, it distinguished man as more emphatically the offspring of God, and constituted the difference between him and the brute creation.—What then distinguished man from brutes?

1. While brutes were made wholly of inferior elements, with spirits that tend downward, man claims affinity with the heavenly world, God having superadded to his earthly nature a living soul, which he infused of his own immortal breath. Now, it must be admitted that slavery can never, in point of fact, blot this feature of the divine image from the soul of man, by making him any thing but an immortal being; yet it overlooks his immortality, and treats this undying spirit as though it were mere matter, having no higher origin than the earth, and looking forward to no higher destiny than the brutes that perish. This immortal being, this living soul, which God kindled in man with the quenchless fires of his own immortality, which is to return to its author to dwell with God forever, to sing with angels, and swell the loud

triumphs of heaven and the glories of the throne ; or sink in endless perdition, as a fallen spirit unworthy of a heavenly sphere ;—this being is made a personal chattel to be bought and sold, is made an instrument of gratification to the hell-born passions of ambition and lust, is yoked with the brute, and driven through life by the sting of the task master's lash like the ox that perishes, as though there were no heaven for the negro beyond the delusive dream that intrudes itself upon his short hours of slumbering repose, so soon disturbed by the well-known sound of the horn that summons him to a renewal of his toils, and as though there were no hell for him to shun beyond the limits of the cotton-field, the sugar plantation or the rice swamp.

2. While God created the brute animals with nothing to rule their spirits and guide their actions but the impulse of an instinctive nature, he endowed man with the more noble faculty of reason, and thus formed him after the model of his own nature, who is the only being in the universe possessing reason in absolute perfection. Now it is too plain to need proof that slavery labors to keep the enslaved in ignorance and even tries to extinguish the lamp of reason with which God lit up the soul of man. Slaveholders admit, yea, contend that human beings cannot be held in slavery without being also held in ignorance, and hence no provision is made for the instruction of slaves ; yea, more, laws are enacted to prevent their instruction under heavy penalties, and every effort possible is made to shut out light and to close every avenue to the soul, lest one enkindling ray should lighten and ignite the dark spirits of the enslaved. Thus you see that slavery does all it can to blot the image of God from the soul of man, by degrading him, in point of intelligence, as nearly as may be, to a level with the brutes.—While the lettered master boasts of his knowledge, pressing onwards in the course of science and philosophy, until he makes the heavens the play-ground of his thoughts, and regales himself with flowers plucked from the pathway of revolving worlds, he imposes the blackest ignorance upon the spirits he holds in bonds, suffering not one beam of light to fall upon their rayless orbs ;—spirits by God himself made capable of constant and endless improvement, destined to blaze and shed their light upon the spheres of a cloudless world, are by the very system of slavery consigned to a night of ignorance as black as the brow of despair, and as perpetual as the roll of successive generations.

III. The resolution charges slavery with the crime of degrading man from the dignified rank which his Maker gave him in the scale of creation. God placed man over the work of his hands, saying, “let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth.” This glory and honor, with which God crowned his new-made creature man, slavery plucks from his brow, it dismantles him of the authority which his Creator gave him, and with its profane and heaven-provoking hand, hurls him down from the sphere assigned him by God himself, and gives him a place among the brutes that perish. It should be remarked that the authority with which God crowned the first man, to subdue, rule, and possess the world, belongs equally to all men, for it was conferred equally upon all men in the person of a common father. “God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth,” and it was when the blood of all men, the blood of the white and the black man, flowed undistinguished in the veins of a common father, and rushed through its arterial way at the pulsations of the same undivided heart, that God bestowed on him the right to possess and rule the world, and hence, this right of possession and control belongs equally to all men without distinction of color or nation. This right is evidently wrested from man, for the law of slavery declares that he can possess nothing, which is so far from suffering him to rule any part of the world, that it will not suffer him to rule himself, no, not his own limbs, but compels him to submit

them to act as they are acted upon by the dictates of another's will. God says, as much to the black man as to the white man, "Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth," but slavery says, "Not so, Lord, he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor can he acquire any thing but what must belong to his master," and which tells the truth, God or slavery, I will leave you to judge.

IV. Slavery is charged in this resolution with the crime of subverting all the social relations which God and nature have rendered essential to man's earthly allotment.

Man is a social being, his Maker formed him for society, and gave him a nature which claims reciprocal enjoyments from kindred spirits; hence, wherever man is found he is known to exist in some kind of society, and taste, though too often with a savage appetite, the sweets of friendly intercourse. God having created man to exist in a social state, he has given us rules by which we should be governed in our intercourse with each other, but slavery tramples upon these rules, and pours its full cup of wormwood and gall into the very fountains of human society. I cannot particularize but will note one or two points as specimens of the whole.

1. Slavery annihilates the matrimonial institution. This lies at the very foundation of society, it is the fountain which sends out its living streams, and fertilizes this desert world with the buds and flowers and rich harvest of social animation. This institution is the oldest known to man, its plan was laid by God himself when he declared, "It is not good that the man should be alone," it was established when God, having formed a woman, brought her to the man and presented a bride fair and innocent in the light of the first morn, and it was first celebrated in Eden's undefiled bowers, ere depravity had corrupted the fountains of the heart, or one blush of guilt had reddened the countenance serene. And God having instituted matrimony, Christ says, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh, therefore, those whom God hath joined together let not man put asunder;" and yet slavery does this; it lays its unholy hands upon the bridal pair and rends them asunder as though God had not joined them together. But it may be a question with some whether there is any such thing as matrimony among slaves. I know there is not, there cannot be, so far as matrimony is to be regarded as a legal contract, but are they married in the sight of God? So far as this argument is concerned it matters not whether they are married or not, for I will take a position which will make the argument good in either alternative. I say, then, they are married or they are not; if they are married, then slavery parts those whom God hath joined together; and if they are not married then slavery annihilates the institution, and so far as the three million of slaves are concerned, the entire South is one scene of corruption, pollution, and rottenness. Take which horn of the dilemma you please, and the argument is good: say that slaves are married, and you charge slavery with parting husbands and wives, and of making twain of those whom God has pronounced one; or say that slaves are not married, and you charge slavery with the entire subversion of a divine institution. I repeat, take which horn of the dilemma you please, either will hang up slavery to the contemptuous gaze of all who have pure and virtuous eyes, and to be pierced by the fiery arrows of God Almighty's law.

2. Slavery annihilates the obligation growing out of the relation subsisting between parents and children. The command of God is, "Children obey your parents in the Lord, and ye fathers provoke not your children to wrath, but train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." God says. Children obey your parents in the Lord, but slavery says, No, not so, Lord, they must obey their masters who own both parents and children, and have the

right of separating them forever, by selling the one at auction and the other by the pound. The son is robbed of all interest in his sire out of whose loins he came, is denied all right of obeying him during the years of his minority, or of assisting him in the riper years of his manhood ; he cannot even reach out his hand to wipe the tear from his grief-furrowed cheek, or to support his faltering limbs as he is hastened down life's declivity by the sting of the driver's lash.

The daughter has no right to obey her mother, cannot administer to the comfort of her who in anguish gave her being, cannot pour one drop of consolation into that grief-charged bosom from which she drew her first nutriment, and at which she was nurtured and reared from helpless infancy to endure the woes of riper years.

Parents are also denied the right of responding to the obligations due to their offspring. God commands parents to "train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," but slavery says, No, parents, ye shall not train up your children, or if you do, it shall not be for yourselves nor for the Lord, but for me, that I may sacrifice your sons on the altar of my avarice, and your daughters upon the altar of my lust.

Thus you see that the resolution is true to the very letter. Slavery usurps the prerogatives of God, tends to blot the divine image from the soul of man, degrades him from the dignified rank his Maker gave him in the scale of creation, and subverts all the social relations which God and nature have rendered essential to his earthly allotment. But though I think I have sustained the resolution, yet I feel that I have come far short of giving a full view of the sinfulness and horrors of slavery ; I have only discovered to you the points of the serpent's forked tongue ; the body of the viper, in hideous form, still lies concealed, and is known in the ever-abiding miseries, and dark horrors of the cotton field, the sugar plantation, and the rice swamp, from which I have not attempted to draw the veil. Let no one think that I have given an exaggerated view of the subject ; exaggeration is impossible, the reality transcends the power of fiction, and every attempt at declamation lessens the sublime horror of slavery. To describe it would require words that should, at the same time, shriek with terrors of death, shade with the night of despair, and glow with the fires of hell. O could I wake the winds of the South, and cause them to pour into the ears of this assembly, the sighs and groans and shrieks of tortured fathers, and tortured mothers, and tortured sons, and tortured daughters, I should need no other argument, for such sighs and groans and shrieks, coming up from the dark land of slavery, and concentrating at this point, would howl in the ears of the assembly in notes as wild as the cheer of assembled ghosts. But I must forbear, or my indignant soul will substitute execration for argument, whereas Michael, when contending with the devil, brought not a railing accusation against him, but said, The Lord rebuke thee : and may the Lord rebuke slavery : rebuke it as Christ rebuked intruding devils, with a rebuke that sent them back in scampering haste to their native hills, and may it not, like the ejected legion, be permitted to enter into the swine, but be driven naked and unattended down the gulf of everlasting chaos and oblivion, never more to lift its serpentine head this side of the bourne that divides this from the world of wo. Let it be blotted from the polluted records of the church, let it be blotted from the disgraced annals of the State and Nation, and if it must have an enduring page assigned it on which to write its dark crimes, let it be in the biography of some damned ghost, or in the history of Beelzebub the prince of the devils.

The Rev. JAMES R. WILLSON, D. D., of the Reformed (Covenanters') Church, Orange co., N. Y., seconded the motion, and said that half a century ago, nineteen-twentieths of the people of the slaveholding states would have

seconded this motion. At the present time, nineteen-twentieths of the people of the northern states would second the motion in the *abstract*, and he proceeded to show that the condemnation of slavery in the *abstract*, while it is justified in the *concrete*, is as inconsistent as to say that two and three make six. He followed slavery through the Old and New Testament, along the coast of Africa, through the horrors of the middle passage, among the plantations of the South, in its demoralizing effects upon the public mind at Washington and elsewhere, and showed that it was evil, and only evil, and that continually, loathed in the eyes of God, and detested by all moral and godly men. The whole second table of the decalogue, he said, proceeded on the principle that man has a right to himself. He therefore concluded slavery was evil in the abstract, and in the concrete, condemned and odious in the eyes of God and good men, and the voice of both declared that the general jubilee of emancipation should be proclaimed throughout the land.

ANDREW HARRIS, of Philadelphia, a graduate of the University of Vermont, offered the following:

Resolved, That the Degradation and Crime which exist among the Colored People, are the result of the wrongs under which they labor."

ANDREW HARRIS' SPEECH.

He spoke with much freedom and force, in support of a resolution, That the degradation and crime charged upon the free colored population of this country, is the result of the wrongs under which they suffer.

It is with no pleasant feelings, said he, that I stand here to speak in relation to the wrongs of a portion of the inhabitants of this country, who, by their complexion, are identified with myself. It is with feelings of great responsibility that I stand here as their representative.

Who of our pilgrim fathers, when they entered ship, and committed themselves to the waves—when the breeze carried back the echo of their songs, ever thought the day would come, when an assembly like this would meet on the island of Manhattan, for such an object! Who would then have supposed, that the oppression and wrongs of millions in this country, would have been so great as to call together an audience like this? If an inhabitant of another world should enter one of these doors, and look abroad upon these thousands, and ask, 'For what are you assembled?' and the voice of this multitude should be heard in answer, 'We have come here to hear and converse about the wrongs of our fellow men,' would he esteem it a light or trifling thing, which has brought this audience together?

But from whence spring these wrongs!—the original source from which they spring, is the corruption of the human heart. The beginning of its development is *slavery*. Shall I again point to the South, and depict the sufferings of the slave? If the groans and sighs of the victims of slavery could be collected, and thrown out here in one volley, these walls would tremble, these pillars would be removed from their foundations, and we should find ourselves buried in the ruins of the edifice. If the blood of the innocent, which has been shed by slavery, could be poured out here, this audience might swim in it,—or if they could not swim they would be drowned. If the tears that slavery has caused to be shed, were poured out here, there might be a sea on which to ply the oar in exercise of sport and diversion. But this is not all—the anguish produced by the separation of husband and wife, children and parents, and the scourges of the defenceless and unoffending slave, are a fathomless sea, and an ocean without a shore.

But slavery does not stop here. It presses down upon the free people of color. Its deadly poison is disseminated from the torrid regions of the South.

to the frigid North. We feel it here. Yet, with all this, if the colored man is vicious, or if he is not elevated, it is set down to his natural stupidity and depravity, and the argument is raised that he belongs to an inferior race. The colored people are also charged with want of desire for education and improvement; yet, if a colored man comes to the door of our institutions of learning, with desires ever so strong, the lords of these institutions rise up and shut the door; and then you say we have not the desire nor the ability to acquire education. Thus, while the white youth enjoy all these advantages, we are excluded and shut out, and must remain ignorant. It is natural to suppose, then, that there should be more crime among us. But is this crime properly chargeable to the colored man, as evidence of the vicious propensities of his race?

Again, in the social relations of life, wrongs are inflicted upon us that are grievous and heavy to be borne, and we must fold our arms and bear it. But even this is thrown out as a taunt against us, that we do not speak of our wrongs, as evidence that we are too stupid and degraded to feel them: while, if we rise to defend ourselves, and to plead our cause, the torch and the brick-bat are poured out as arguments on the other side. As a specimen, I will mention what I experienced in my passage to this city, from the city of "brotherly love," so called; but as to the claim it has upon that title, I leave the ruins of Pennsylvania Hall to answer. On the way, they refused to give the colored man a seat, but put him up in boxes, as they would monkeys or wild geese. And why was this? was it because he had no money? No. Was it because he was not decently clad? No. Was it because he was an idiot, and they feared he would annoy the company with his foolishness? No—it is because he has *the complexion which God has given him*. The Bible says the love of money is the root of all evil; and if the love of money is a predominant passion anywhere, it is in this land. Yet, without disputing the correctness of the declaration, it seems to me that slavery has developed a passion in the human heart that is stronger than the love of money; for they refuse to gratify this disposition which the Bible says is the root of all evil, through the influence of that still deeper root of evil, *prejudice*.

Again: the colored man is deprived of the opportunity of obtaining those situations in society which his enemies say he ought to hold, if capable. If he wishes to be useful as a professional man, a merchant or a mechanic, he is prevented by the color of his skin, and driven to those menial employments which tend to bring us more and more into disrepute.

The church itself was not free from participation in the general guilt of oppressing the black man. He feared that some of her pastors would in the great day, have the Judge say to them, though ye have cast out devils in my name, yet this devil of prejudice you have not cast out of your own hearts—and though you may have done many wonderful works, one great work, that of emancipating the slave, ye have left undone.

Time would fail me, said he, to depict all these wrongs. Yet, with all the oppression and odium that is heaped upon us here, I for one would rather stand and endure it all, choosing rather to suffer affliction with my people, than to emigrate to a foreign shore, though I might there enjoy the pleasures of Egypt. And while I live, let my prayer be, that the same soil which cherished my father may cherish me; and when I die, that the same dust may cover me that covered the ashes of my father.

JAMES C. FULLER.

JAMES CANNINGS FULLER, of Skeneatelas, N.Y., having been introduced as a member of the Society of Friends, said he did not appear in that capacity, but as a MAN, to second the resolution offered by his young friend. The young brother had spoken about colleges; but he came from the herd and the flock.

He had no objection, however, that the simple ram's horn, which alone he could blow, should exalt the silvery tones of his young colored brother. Personally that young man was unknown to him, but he was not ignorant of his character and history: he had gone back, in his inquiries, to his origin. He had been brought up in the family of a Presbyterian minister, by a man and his wife who never had been worth \$500 in their lives, and had a family of nine children of their own. The doors of Union College had been shut against him simply on account of his color, and he had been obliged to go to Vermont to a college where that was no bar. Once, when this young man had been coming down the canal, he met with a southern man, who inquired if he could read; and when informed that he could read Greek, he was astonished, and introduced him to the table with himself. But why was he astonished? Because he knew that the northern men had trod him in the dust. Had prejudice operated in regard to this youth he never would have stood before that audience. Mr. F. called on all, especially on his female friends to sacrifice these prejudices, to come over to the aid of the despised abolitionists, to encourage the education of colored gentlemen, to countenance them in common schools, and possibly they might thus exert a happy influence over their husbands, whose pockets, and perhaps their ears also, were now stuffed with cotton.

MR. STANTON.

MR. H. B. STANTON, one of the Corresponding Secretaries of the Society, offered the following resolution:

"Resolved, that the political power of the free States is sufficient, if properly exercised, to ultimately exterminate slavery in the nation."

I am aware, said Mr. S., that the doctrine of this resolution is almost new—contrary to the generally received opinion even among abolitionists. But, in attempting to establish it, I shall adduce only obvious facts, and common place arguments.

I will first speak of the action of the General Government—and only of such action as may be secured by the numerical power of the people of the free States.

First. We can abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. I will not stop to prove that Congress has the power to do this. Words could not express it plainer than our Constitution does; and had the framers of that instrument attempted to make it plainer, they would have but "darkened counsel by words without knowledge." Nor will I insult the understandings and hearts of this Republican and Christian audience, by attempting to prove that justice, humanity, and religion demand the immediate exercise of this power; but will call their attention to the effect of this measure.—[1] Before slavery can be abolished in the District, there must be a discussion of the whole subject on the floor of both Houses of Congress. All the arguments with which abolitionists have flooded the North, would there be brought forward to prove the intrinsic iniquity, the cruelty, the impolicy of slaveholding; and all the objections with which the advocates of this institution fortify themselves, would there be encountered and dashed in pieces. This grand tournament of the Northern and Southern Cavaliers would take place in sight of the whole American people. The sound of the clashing armour would be heard from the Aroostook to the Sabine. The light flashing from their steel would be reflected into the dark places of the South now filled with the habitations of cruelty. A thorough discussion of this whole subject in the halls of our National Legislature, would be equal to its discussion in the Legislature of every slaveholding State in the Union. [2] The act of abolition being done, the moral influence of it would pierce to the heart of the whole system. It would pronounce and sign its death-warrant. It

would be the solemn verdict of the nation decreeing the annihilation of this dark abomination. The highest legislative body of the Union, representing the whole people, would declare slavery to be unfit to live—for, let us not forget that Congress will abolish it, not because it has the power, but because of its intrinsic wickedness. The act would speak in authoritative tones to every slaveholding state, “Go thou and do likewise!” It would write in letters of flashing fire over the gateway of the National Capitol, “No admittance for Slavery.” The whole system would thus be outlawed, branded with ignominy, consigned to execration and ultimate destruction—which may God grant right early! This, Sir, is not the mere fancy sketch of the imagination, but the testimony of sober reason. Why do the South rally around the District of Columbia, and contest the ground inch by inch, with ferocity unprecedented? Why their painful sensibility on this point, if the result is merely the emancipation of 7000 slaves? Ah! the blow which batters down this gate of the citadel in the ten miles square, shakes the entire fabric to its foundations. Well has Senator Preston said that the District of Columbia was the bridge over the moat leading into the whole South. Once carried, and moral power might pass over to do battle with slavery in the States. Hence the desperation of the South to defend the bridge.

Second. Another power to be wielded by the North for the extermination of slavery, is the prohibition, by Congress, of the internal slave trade. I shall not stop to reply to the sophistical and puerile arguments of Mr. Clay, denying the power of Congress in the premises. They evince a greater anxiety, on his part, to please the South and secure the Presidency, than to be regarded as a logician and a sound constitutional lawyer. Suffice it to say, that that clause of the Constitution which gave power to Congress to decapitate the foreign slave trade, also confers power to cut the sinews of the domestic. Under a power to regulate foreign commerce, Congress prohibited the former. So obvious was the right to do so, that the framers of the Constitution, wishing to preserve the foreign trade 20 years, inserted a clause in that instrument restricting the exercise of this obvious power till the expiration of that period. The same clause of the Constitution gives Congress power to regulate commerce among the several States. And surely the man-mongers, whom Mr. Clay wishes to propitiate, will not deny that the traffic in slaves among the States, is commerce. Nor will Henry Clay, the lawyer and statesman, deny, that if the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations,” confers power to prohibit one branch of it, (the foreign slave trade,) the power “to regulate commerce among the several States,” also confers power to prohibit one branch of it (the inter-state slave trade)—whatever Henry Clay, the trading politician, may find it convenient to deny. Nor will I multiply arguments as to the moral effect, upon the South, of the discussion of this great subject by Congress, but will come to the direct influence of the prohibition.

Look, Sir, at two admitted facts existing in the northern and southern portions of the slaveholding States. In the extreme South, by their severe process of sugar and molasses manufacturing, and cotton raising, the ranks of humanity are thinned, and thousands of slaves worked into a premature grave. This process, if applied in the like ratio to the whole human race, would depopulate the globe in three centuries. Why this dreadful overworking—this murder by wholesale? It is necessary to render slaveholding profitable in that section of the country. But, their effective slave population would be exterminated in half a century were it not that the dreadful vacuum is supplied. And whence the supply? The northern slave States. They are the Congo and Guinea of America. Thus, through the influence of the internal trade, slavery is a profitable system at the extreme South. Now look at the influence of the prohibition of this trade on the profitableness of slavery in the northern slave States. There, were there no great sluice-way to pour off the superabundance of their slave popula-

tion, it would increase beyond the means of profitable employment. Only a small portion of the natural increase is needed to cultivate the corn, the tobacco and the hemp of Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and parts of Virginia and North Carolina, and were it not for this grand canal of horrors, "the *infernal* slave trade," the dark waters would overflow, and drown the profitableness of the system in these States, and compel them to emancipate in order to save themselves from destruction. Therefore has it been well said, that this trade is the great jugular vein of slavery. And if Congress will employ the same weapon with which it clove down the foreign trade, to cut this internal artery, the monster would die—starvation would slowly but surely consume him in his southern, and apoplexy in his northern abode. Fifteen years would number him among the dishonoured dead. He would be entombed under a nation's execration where resurrection would never reach him.

Thirdly. It is in the power of the free States, through Congress, to admit no more slave States to the Union, while they may admit many whose constitutions are not stained with the blood of oppression. I need not tell you, sir, that for the last thirty years, the South, although inferior to the North in numbers and resources, have controlled the nation, and governed us with despotic sway. On the subject of slavery, they have acted as one man, with one heart, swayed by one impulse: while the North, in regard to freedom, has been distracted, divided, and broken into a thousand fragments. This has enabled the South to sell her political influence at an enormous price. She has come into the market with her electoral votes, and cried, "Who bids?" The North has replied, "What is your price?" The South answers, "Let us rule; guarantee to us the perpetuity of our peculiar institutions; give us the right to say when we shall have war and when peace; when an embargo, and when a tariff; when we shall have a southern slave-driver for President, and when a northern man with southern principles; give us full right to whip, imprison, lynch, hang, and burn whom and when we choose; with the privilege of trampling on the right of petition and the freedom of speech at pleasure—and, at all events, secure us in our slaveholding—this is the price." And, sir, to our eternal disgrace be it said, we have promptly paid it. But whence came all this power of the South—whence the ability to offer this tempting bribe of 126 electoral votes to northern political aspirants? We have placed it in her hands by admitting, since the Union was formed, seven slave States. When the Union was established, there were six slave States, and seven [now] free States. The balance of power was in the hands of the North. They might have denied admission to slave States. But no! While they have admitted seven slave States, only six free States have been inducted into the Union. With the birth right of freedom in their possession, they have sold it, and have not got even the mess of pottage. In return for their priceless treasure, they have obtained the privilege of being ruled by man-mongers and drivers with a more than Autocratic despotism.

But, it is not yet too late to remedy the evil, and bring back into northern hands an available balance of power. Let your mind, Mr. President, rest for a moment on this proposition, while I point you to the North-western section of our country. See that almost boundless region, stretching from Lakes Michigan and Superior, westward to the sunset,—fertilized with its hundred rivers, studded with its beautiful lakes, rich in its luxuriant soil, undulated with its gentle forest slopes, and diversified with its unshadowed prairies, all uniting to lure the huntsman and the husbandman, the mechanic and the merchant. See New England, the fountain head of population, pouring its tide of activity and industry almost over the Rocky Mountains; and see scarcely a drop of this tide flowing down to pollute itself with the turbid waters of the South. Behold as by magic the rising up of smiling villages, listen to the hum of trade, hear the dashing of the shuttle on the banks of the waterfalls, see the valleys

blooming with tropical verdure and the hills waving with harvests to their very tops, while the rivers and the lakes are whitened by the sails of the heavy laden water-craft, or clouded with the smoke of darting steamers teeming with life. See your Lowells, and your Springfields, and your Rochesters, and your Buffalos, and your Pittsburghs, springing up with scenic rapidity, till the whole of this vast region is covered with Keystone and Empire States. And thanks be to the God of freedom, the foot print of a slave shall never pollute and curse this modern Eden. Here, Sir, is our hope for the final extermination of slavery. Six or eight large States shall yet march into the Union with free banners floating in the breeze. Already are those young sovereigns Wisconsin and Iowa preparing to take their seats at the council board of the nation. Others are soon to throng in their train. And what has the South to checkmate them? Only Florida, a land of swamps and Seminole Indians. And even that cannot be admitted to the Union with slavery, if the North will do its duty. Thus Freedom will gain the ascendancy. I may remark in passing, that we can easily see the cause of southern anxiety for the annexation of Texas to the confederacy. She needs it to checkmate the northwest territory. Now, let us be firm and reject the proffered alliance, and admit no more slave States to the Union, while we open the doors wide and beckon in State after State from the free northwest, and the General Government is in our hands. Then the perpetuation of freedom will be the great idea of national legislation. Slavery will melt away before its burning action, till the last vestige of it shall have disappeared. Then, practice shall walk hand in hand with profession, and the Republic shall go forth to enstamp its free principles on the face of the globe. Liberty shall be the rallying cry—and

“The dwellers in the vales, and on the rocks,
Shout to each other, and the mountain tops
From distant mountains catch the flying joy ;
Till, nation after nation taught the strain,
Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round !”

In the next place, sir, let me call your attention to the great influence which the free States, by independent State action, may exert for the extermination of slavery in the nation. Abolitionists do not overrate the influence of such action. I recently read a statement in a Charleston paper, affirming that slavery has now more to fear from the legislation of the free States than from that of the General Government. What can the sovereign States do?

First.—They can blot from their constitutions and statutes, all those provisions which graduate the rights of their citizens by the color of their skins—thus removing the corner stone of slavery. Let the plough of reform be buried beam deep among those absurd and unholy provisions, by which rights are measured by the physical hue rather than the moral worth of the owner, and let man be recognized as man, and the man-imbruting system of the South is uprooted. Samson-like let us carry away these supporting pillars, though our society or even ourselves should be crushed in the fall. Let New York take the lead, and beckon onward the other free States.

Second.—Let us secure judicial decisions, such as that given in Massachusetts, by Chief Justice Shaw, that the moment a slave comes, with the master's consent, within the bounds of the State, his chains fall off, and he is *ipso facto* free. Connecticut, once the land of “*blue laws*” but now no longer the land of “*black acts*,” has given a similar decision. New Jersey has made the same decision—and long since Vermont decided that “nothing short of a bill of sale from the Almighty” would entitle man to own his fellow among her Green Mountains. These decisions obtained in every free state, (and why should they not be?) and those southern gentlemen who annually swarm at the

watering places of the North, with palm-leaf hats, and Bowie knives, and pockets full of money, to bribe, and frighten, and wheedle us from our duty, would find it exceedingly perplexing to be thus summarily and unceremoniously deprived of their servants.

Third.—Let us obtain a jury trial for such fugitives as are not *brought* but *come* from the South. In most of the States, the moment the poor fugitive crosses Mason's and Dixson's line, those biped hounds that howl for hire on the track of human game, are upon him in full cry, foaming and gnashing their teeth, ready to seize and drag him back to his pursuers. Even the forms of a trial are almost denied, and the whole process of his delivering up is a mockery of justice. But a better day is dawning. Massachusetts, Vermont, and Connecticut have given him twelve men to decide upon the claims of his hunter. The popular branch of your own State Legislature has done the same. Give the panting fugitive this inestimable right in every northern State, and he is safe,—for, where can you find twelve impartial men among us who will decide on their oaths, that a man has not a better right to himself than another has to him—that the blood which runs in his veins is not his own—that the right to liberty is not inalienable? Sir, secure this right to fugitives, and all the northern slave States are speedily drained of their slaves.

Fourth.—Another power possessed by the free States which they should exercise is, to protest against the unconstitutional laws of the South which imprison our coloured citizens who visit them. You are aware, Sir, that such laws exist in many southern States. A coloured citizen from this city may visit Alabama on business, and he is thrown into prison to taste the sweets of the contented and happy institution, and in due time, is sold as a slave to pay his prison expenses! Such instances, alas, are too common. They should be remonstrated against in thunder tones. Old Massachusetts has set the example. Her legislature at its last session, hurled an indignant rebuke at these Vandal statutes, and empowered the Governor to send a special delegation to the South and demand the release of such citizens, in the name of the Commonwealth. Let His Excellency Commission our Lorings, our Alvords, our Childs, to visit the South and make the demand, and let the example be followed by every northern State, and the southerners will quail before these ministers plenipotentiary of sovereign States—these ambassadors of freedom.

Fifth.—We should also use legislative remonstrance. The South have set us the example. Their legislatures have appealed to ours to suppress the right of free discussion, and crush our organizations. Let ours now appeal to theirs to destroy that system which alone renders it necessary, in their opinion, to trample down our most precious rights. The South, it is alleged, is very generous, humane, and conscientious. Let our legislatures appeal to this generosity, humanity, and conscience. Let us turn up this rich moral soil to the light of the sun, and scatter in the seed till it shall spring up and yield a luxuriant harvest. Let the man-robbing, woman-scourging, Bible-withholding South, hear the deep-toned echo of our remonstrance. Let the voice go forth. Let New York appeal to Virginia. Let Massachusetts remonstrate with South Carolina. Let Ohio plead with Kentucky. Let no quarter be shown to unconstitutional aggression—no childish anxiety or fear in regard to the Union—but uncompromising attachment to the great principles of the Declaration of Independence.

All this array of influences *may* be insufficient for the overthrow of slavery. Should the South maintain herself against them all, the North has a *dernier ressort*. We will alter the constitution and bring slavery in the States within the range of Federal legislation, and then annihilate it at a blow. Do you regard the necessary amendment of the constitution as beyond the reach of possibility? Sir, the time is not very remote, when, if no new slave States are ad-

mitted to the Union, three fourths of the confederacy will be undefiled with slavery. A close observer will discover from the signs of the times, that many years will not have passed ere Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and Missouri emancipate their slaves—especially should Congress prohibit the internal slave trade. Florida will choose to be admitted to the Union without the curse rather than not at all. These, with the thirteen States now free and the six new States which will undoubtedly be admitted from the North West Territory within the next quarter of a century, will give the requisite constitutional majority (three fourths) for the alteration of the United States' Constitution. And will they hesitate to do it? No! The continued aggressions and outrages of the slaveholding power will drive them to it. Lynch law will reign triumphant in those dark regions, and Northern rights will be trodden in the mire, till forbearance and remonstrance will cease to be virtues, and then, the twenty-five free States will rise as one man and proclaim in the ears of slaveholding arrogance, “Thus far shalt thou come and no farther, and here thy proud waves shall be stayed!” The Constitution will be altered, and slavery and its twin brother Lynch law, be hurled headlong to their graves.

We are here met with an objection—“It would violate the compact thus to amend the Constitution.” What compact—the *written* or the *unwritten*? The *unwritten* compact was an anti-slavery compact. It was the understanding of the Jays, the Rushes, and the Franklins of the olden time, that slavery, long ere this, was to have been swept from the whole country. True to their pledges, the confiding North returned home from the convention which formed the Constitution, and commenced the work of abolition, and now we behold thirteen States unpolluted with this evil. The South, with characteristic treachery, returned home to make tighter the bonds of the oppressed.—But, the *written* compact. This provides for and authorizes its own amendment whenever three-fourths of the States require it. I, therefore, go for the compact, both written and unwritten.

But, who are those so loud in their denunciations of all violations of the compact? The very men who have rode rough shod over the Declaration of Independence in their defence of a system which declares open war on its holiest provisions. Men who have lynched the freedom of speech, and tarred and feathered the right of petition, and kidnapped the right of free locomotion, and rode our Republicanism on a rail before the world, and dashed in the windows of our national honor, and burnt our Christianity at the stake, and made a foot-mat of the Constitution to wipe their despotic feet on. Away with such hypocrisy!

But, it may be said, that the South, in such a case, would have *their* dernier resort. Rather than submit to such arbitrary power, the remaining slave States, with characteristic chivalry and honor, would rush to a dissolution of the Union. Well, Sir, they would not be the first community, who, because they could not have their way, were led by an evil spirit down a steep place into the sea and choked. Dissolve the Union and hope to exist afterwards? Rather talk of the town paupers dissolving their connexion with the town—and all because they cannot be made selectmen, and supervisors, and superintendents of the poor, and members of the legislature. I would not speak too lightly of the Union, but really this threat of dissolution is becoming stale. It is

“—— Like a thrice told tale,
Vexing the dull ear of a drowsy man.”

Look for a moment at their condition after they have committed the suicidal act. Their slaves might then cry havoc, and light the incendiary torch, and whet the assassin knife, and desolate the entire South. No constitutional compact would make it our duty to suppress this domestic violence. Or,

should their bondmen choose a less sanguinary mode of redress (which Heaven grant) they might rush *en masse* over the border, and, if our prejudices were too strong to permit them to tarry among us, they might press onward to the North—flying on the wings of steam, till the panting fugitive should rest his weary limbs under the grateful shadow of Victoria's throne.

Dissolve the Union to perpetuate slavery? They would concentrate on them the world's unmitigated scorn. Great Britain, led on by her Broughams and her Buxtons would cripple their commerce and exclude their productions from her market. France, her West India Colonies then free, would delight to execrate them. Denmark, now about to emancipate her Colonial bondmen, would unite with Spain to abhor them: and even Russia and Turkey, would meet them with the taunt, “O Lucifer! Sun of the morning! How art thou fallen! Art thou become as one of us?” And Asia, with her “many lettered casts” would summon her Polish exiles, and her Botany Bay felons, to point the finger of reproach at them. The dark tribes of Africa, long cursed and made desolate by American man stealers, would loathe them, while her freed-men of the Cape of Good Hope would laugh them to scorn. The South American States would unite with Mexico to drive them from the brotherhood of Republics, and the islands of the Caribbean Sea would send up a thunder shout of rebuke for holding their brethren in chains. At every court, their slave-breeding ministers would encounter an O'Connell—on every sea their pirate flag would be insulted, and throughout the civilized and uncivilized world their very name would be the synonym of all that was base and detestable. There the slaveholding republic would stand under the gaze of the nations, side by side with Brazil, that most grovelling and mean of all despots, bawling out that all men are created equal and entitled to liberty, while they held in degrading servitude one half their population. It would not be left for a few “fanatics” to “exclude them from the pale of civilization”—but everywhere, and at all times, universal man would shun their contamination as the world's pest, the moral lepers of the human race.

Already does the South begin to appreciate her isolated condition among the nations of the earth. She confesses that the literature of the world is against her, and she proposes to get up an expurgated edition adapted to her “peculiar institutions.” What will be her success? She must exclude all the poets from Homer and Virgil down to John G. Whittier and William Cullen Bryant,—for every line of genuine poetry is redolent with liberty. She must expel from her libraries the works of all the orators from the times of Demosthenes and Cicero to the days of Pitt and Fox and Brougham,—for they all plead for liberty and the rights of man. The writings of eminent jurists who have given law to nations, from my Lord Coke and Sir William Blackstone to our own Kent and Story, will be peculiarly obnoxious. The works of all the historians from Moses to Bancroft must be mutilated. They are *every* incendiary. They discourse of revolutions—their pages are red with the blood of martyrs who fell in the defence of liberty—they exalt to admiration the heroes of every age who, on the field of glory, “struck for freedom or a grave.” The miscellaneous writers who beguile the tedious hour, the Addisons, the Sternes, the Hannah Mores, the Edgeworths, must all be excluded from a slaveholding literature. They must even rob their lilly-fingered ladies of their novels—those soft daughters of the sunny South, who sigh sentimentally over imaginary woes, while with the cow-skin they excoriate the back of unprotected woman—for, the novelists, from Richardson to Bulwer, have interwoven with their fancy sketches the sober realities of inalienable rights. Those sterner productions, too, of the fathers of the great religious denominations, the Foxes, the Calvins, the Luthers, the Wesleys, will be subjected to the literary *taboo*. As yet, the labor of expurgation is but just begun. Let them de-

stroy the works of their own Jefferson, their Washington, their Patrick Henry, and their Wythe. Let them dig up the bones of these old incendiaries, and burn them a sacrifice to their idol. Nor have they yet begun. Let them blot from existence their bills of rights, mutilate their State Constitutions, and annihilate the Declaration of Independence. The Bible,—aye, Sir, THE BIBLE! let its every page be erased and its every precept forgotten—banish it from the world—for while it exists abolition lives and moves and has its being. Nor is this enough. Not only the word but the works of God record their testimony against them. The free breezes, the wild waves utter their voices against slavery. Their very soil, mildewed with a thriftless agriculture and blasted by unrequited labor—its thorns and thistles magnify the impolicy of their system. Expurgated literature, forsooth! Let them get up an expurgated edition of the human mind—for, all its faculties shrink with horror from the chain and the gag,—while the conscience of the slaveholder is his ever faithful and ever abiding monitor. Sir, I would speak it reverently, but, before he can escape rebuke for his crime, the American man holder must not only expurgate the literature of the world, and stifle the voice of nature, but he must dethrone the Deity; for, as their great statesman has said, “in a contest of the oppressed with the oppressor, the Almighty has not an attribute that can take sides with the latter!”

LEWIS TAPPAN.

LEWIS TAPPAN, one of the Executive Committee, seconded the Resolution.

He stated that as the question was often put, *What has the North to do with slavery?*—he would state some facts illustrating the position that the people of the free States, while uttering the loudest notes in favor of liberty, had much to do with it both in favor and in opposition to the execrable system. A President of one of our Northern colleges, who saw the conflagration of Pennsylvania Hall, remarked to him soon after, that 99 out of 100 of the people then in Philadelphia, with whom he conversed, including strangers and clergymen, heartily approved the act. It is evident, he said, that a majority of the people, laymen, ministers, merchants, artisans, lawyers, &c., love slavery, or they could not either apologize for it, or approbate mobbing abolitionists. Mr. T said, he would proceed to show that northern men were deeply interested in slavery. And first he would allude to northern *artisans*. Bowie-knives and cart whips are manufactured in abundance at the North for slaveholders. These, said he, [holding up a parcel of whips.] are WHIPS FOR SLAVES! made at Newark, N. J., a small city in this neighborhood, whose citizens labor for the southern market, and to which, during the late commercial pressure, one or more millions of dollars of protested paper was returned from the slave States. Bowie-knives are also manufactured there, at Springfield, Mass., in this city, and in many other places. He said, as he was passing a shop in this city yesterday he saw one of these knives, [which he exhibited to the audience.] at the window. On stepping in and making inquiries, he learned that ninety of them had been ordered by a Southerner for a military company in one of the southern cities! In a street near he found, he said, a deacon of one of the churches packing up a variety of Bowie knives for southern merchants then in his store. At another time he saw in a bow-window in Broadway, a highly finished Bowie knife [which he exhibited to the audience.] He said, it will be seen that this is highly polished and ornamented, and on the blade is the motto, “DEATH TO ABOLITION.” On inquiry he learned that this instrument had been purchased of a wholesale dealer, who had imported it from England. This importer is a merchant in this city, and is or has been an elder of a church.

Mr. T. said, that slavery also exerted a pernicious influence over our pub-

lishers and booksellers. Many of them in this city have expurgated the works of British authors, and published them for the southern market, without giving any notice of the alterations!

Our Shipmasters likewise, said Mr. T., are under the influence of slavery, and tempted by gain to kidnap and sell into hopeless bondage free citizens of the North. They ship young men at this port, take them to southern cities, put them in prison, and sell them as slaves. He pointed out a fine looking colored young man near him, who had been thus kidnapped by a Yankee captain, and sold into slavery in New Orleans. His name is Isaac Wright. In December, 1837, he was shipped with two colored young men of his acquaintance, who were also free. In New Orleans they were thrown into the Calaboose jail, mercilessly flogged, and afterwards sold as slaves! In a short time they were taken on board a steamer named Bunker Hill (!) and taken to Tennessee. On the passage, Isaac was chained by the ankle to an aged colored woman. A man who purchased Isaac, on learning he was born free, wrote to Philadelphia making inquiries and promising to set him at liberty, if his friends would send on his free papers. They were sent on, but before they arrived Isaac's master had *gambled him away*. JOSHUA COFFIN, one of the twelve men who formed the first Anti-Slavery Society in this country, went to Tennessee, found Isaac, brought him safely to this city without asking any one's leave, and is now seated at his side. In this connexion Mr. T. read a letter from Gov. Seward, to whom representations had been made respecting these young men, promising all the aid in his power for rescuing the two kidnapped young men who are still in slavery.

Mr. T. spoke of the *influence of slavery on our clergymen* who visit the South, and related the case of a Presbyterian minister in the city who had, after strong remonstrance, executed a deed of emancipation for a colored child, now of two years, whom he had left in Maryland when only ten months old, bringing away its mother; declaring, in reply to remonstrances from a brother clergyman, "that he did not want to have any thing to do with the brat," or words to that effect. [The name of this individual was loudly demanded, but Mr. T. refused to give it.] He, however, held the deed of emancipation in his hand. He said he had himself called on this gentleman, and had been rudely treated by him; and had that morning met him in the street, when he said, "Owing to your interference, the mother of that child has gone off. You have robbed me of the woman, and I will never forget you for the act."

Mr. FULLER hoped the deed would be read.

Mr. ARTHUR TAPPAN expressed his dissent. The name ought not to be given. The effect would be better otherwise. A physician, some years since, had driven sharp tacks into the back of his chaise to wound the little boys who might attempt to get on behind: the fact was published without the name, and immediately all the respectable physicians of the city had come forward and denied the act, thus more effectually exposing the name than in any other way.

Mr. (LEWIS) T. referred to another minister, who, after residing some time at the South, had said to the Rev. Albert Barnes of Philadelphia, that "he would as leave buy negroes as a shoulder of mutton," in consequence of which Mr. Barnes had declared he never should enter his pulpit again.

He then spoke of yet another minister* with whom he had once taken sweet

* The Rev. Joel Parker, pastor elect of the Tabernacle church, conceiving himself alluded to by Mr. T. arose in the gallery, at the conclusion of that gentleman's remarks, and asked leave to correct the statement which had been made so far as it related to himself, and the congregation worshipping in the Tabernacle. As to his having been influenced by his recent residence at the South, it might perhaps be so; that was for the public to judge—though his own impression was, that the gentleman who had made the charge had himself undergone a change, his spirit not being as gentle as it once was. The charge

counsel and gone to the house of God in company, who had removed to the South, and been settled over a large congregation there, and since returned to this city, and was now preaching in a large church here, but who had been so contaminated by the society of slaveholders, as to palliate their conduct. Mr. T. had been the victim of ecclesiastical lynch law for speaking the truth of this gentleman, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Mr. T. spoke of the bad influence produced on the minds of *northern laymen*, who go to the South, or come under the slaveholder's influence. He alluded to the brother of Gerrit Smith, Esq., who resides in Florida, and who at a public meeting, after reports had been spread that he was an abolitionist, announced to the audience that so far from the reports being true he had recently become the purchaser of some slaves, when the mayor of the city rose, walked across the hall, shook hands with the speaker, and congratulated him on having become identified with southern institutions. Mr. T. also alluded to a nephew of the President of the Anti-Slavery Society, who had professed religion and resided in France, where his countrymen anticipated he would take a leading part in the benevolent and religious enterprises of the day, but who had become fascinated with a young lady, from one of the southern States then travelling in France, the holder of hundreds of slaves, had married her and taken up his residence in the far South on a slave plantation.

Mr. T. read a letter from the Rev. Dr. BLACK, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in which it was stated that for forty years no member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church (Covenanters) had been permitted to hold slaves, and that the members of that church class slaveholders as the Apostle did, with "murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers." He also read a letter from Rev. Dr. BULL, of England, expressing great astonishment that Republicans, and especially Christians in this country, can hold their fellow-men in bondage.

In conclusion, Mr. T. alluded to a new work just published, entitled "Ame-

on which that brother had been made the subject of discipline had no reference to his sentiments as an advocate of Anti-Slavery, but to his having traduced a minister of the gospel, in charging Mr. P. with having been 'the murderer of Lovejoy.' Mr. P. had been opposed to letting the Tabernacle to the Anti-Slavery Society under an apprehension that the congregation to whom it belonged would probably be insulted; and he was sorry to find that his anticipations had been realized.

Mr. T. did not think it worth while to interrupt the proceedings of the Anniversary by making any reply to the above, but in the newspapers of the same week published the following:—"I opposed the nomination of Mr. Parker, as minister at the Tabernacle, on the ground that since his residence at New Orleans he had shown great inconsistency of character, and cited several public acts of his as evidence of it. About three months afterward I united with about eighty members of his church in forming an anti-slavery society. At this juncture the session cited me to appear before them to answer the charge of "unchristian and disorderly conduct," viz.: slandering Mr. Parker in the remarks made at the meeting of the church three months previous. I took a reporter to take down the proceedings, and, on insisting upon retaining him, the following minute was made by the session of the Broadway Tabernacle Church:

"On motion, *resolved*, that the question be put to Mr. Tappan, whether he adheres to the determination expressed by him of retaining the stenographer, against the order of the session, to which he replied, I **ADHERE TO MY DETERMINATION**; wherefore, *resolved*, that Mr. Lewis Tappan be and hereby is excluded from the communion of the church for **CONTEMNACY** till he give evidence of repentance, in refusing to submit to the order of Session, in retaining a stenographer, for the purpose of taking minutes and spreading all the circumstances of the case before the public, and refusing to submit to other decisions of the session."

The Presbytery, by a majority of three, refused to sustain my appeal (without deciding on the merits of the case) on the ground that the appellant was bound to submit to the session, whether their order was right or wrong, and take an appeal to the higher judiciary, instead of resisting the decision. From this decision of the Presbytery an appeal was taken to the General Assembly."

The General Assembly, May 27th, sustained the appeal, reversed the sentence, and restored Mr. T. to the communion of the church.

riean Slavery, as it is," the perusal of which would make the ears of the inhabitants of this nation, and other nations, tingle. He spoke of the great ability with which the compilation of facts had been made, and strongly recommended the work to every American citizen, especially those who live at the North.

MR. COLVER.

The Rev. Mr. COLVER, of the Baptist Church at Union Village, Washington County, N. Y., offered the following resolution :

"*Resolved*, That the sufferings of the American slaves give their cause peculiar claims upon the sympathies of Christians, paramount to the claims of any other class of our brother men."

The resolution I have had the honor to offer, declares that the claims of American slaves upon the sympathies of Christians, are peculiar, and paramount to the claims of any other class of our brother men.

In rising to support it I feel great embarrassment, not from my subject, but because the audience I am to address has listened with patience to long and good speaking already, until, I presume, their appetite has been, to say the least, well supplied : but as this resolution has been confided to me, and as the topic is one of deep and perpetual interest, I am willing, under all disadvantages, to attempt to say a word or two. The task assigned me is not a hard one, though it is peculiar and in some degree novel. I am called not to sustain the great doctrines of truth and righteousness, but to sustain and to justify what is reproachfully termed "the *Fanaticism* of abolition." We are charged by our opponents with giving an undue prominence to the subject of slavery : as though it had stronger claims to the notice of the Christian world, than other crimes and vices which degrade our land. We plead guilty to the charge—and if this be vile, would to God we were viler still. We don't deny it : and so far from it, I take the bold ground, this day, that the claim arising from the sufferings of the slave is paramount to every other which comes from suffering humanity. I do aver that the slaves have a higher and a stronger demand upon our pity, our prayers, and our efforts for their relief, than any other class of men upon the face of the globe. I say that their cause is not only on a par with every other cause of benevolence, but that it is lifted above it. This position I now propose to sustain by a few remarks.

And, in the first place, I say that the sufferings of the slave are peculiar in their *intensity*. Would that these sufferings, in all their extent, could be presented to our minds again and again with clearer and still clearer light, till the picture should produce a spasmodic effect throughout the community, and our land should throw off from its bosom this hated incubus of hell. The sufferings of the slave are peculiar to himself, as a slave. True it is that there are many in our favored but ungrateful country, who have been bereft of home and native soil, and driven by the strong hand of oppression from the abodes of their infancy and from the graves of their fathers. They traverse their exile way with sighs and tears ; and their deserted homes, now the prey of the rapacious invader, stand an opprobrium to this boasted land of the free. But even the injured aborigines, deep and multiplied as their wrongs have been, even they would not, for worlds, exchange lots with the slave. Exile though the red man be, still he can look upon his wife and his child, and remember that though defrauded they are **FREE**. He is himself a freeman, a brother to the saints, a denizen of heaven's free air and fertile earth, who may look his fellow man in the face and meet him without a blush, upon equal terms. He may still maintain his freedom of thought and dignity of soul, for he calls no man master. Is it so with the slave ? when he not only hears the voice of a mas-

ter, but hears it utter the mandate that separates him from wife and little ones till these heavens shall be no more. If you would know what he suffers, put yourself in his circumstances. He has a wife, and yet he has no wife: for she may be torn from him at any moment, at the nod of another. He has children, and yet he has them not; for on returning from his toil he may find his hut empty, and his sons and his daughters sold into perpetual and hopeless bondage. The strongest ties of nature may be severed at a blow: and even if his little ones are spared to him, he sees them growing up for another, deprived of the blessings of refinement and the higher blessings of religion. There is a torture in the sufferings of the slave which no other suffering contains. The simple non-possession of good is nothing to the deprivation of good once enjoyed, or enjoyed by all others around us. There is a Tantalus in it which no words can tell. The slave of the South is not in the wilds of Africa, where the sight of civilized man has never been known; no, he is in America—in the very bosom of civilization, within sight and touch and taste of all that good which Heaven, with lavish kindness, has poured upon this happy land—but his hands are manacled—he may not touch—nor taste. His very mind is stricken down, he is deprived, defrauded of every thing that makes even angelic being desirable. I say, again, that his sufferings are peculiar—and they are not more peculiar than they are intense. Would that my own heart felt them more. Yes, when I remember that, at this very hour, his flesh may be quivering under the lash,—his soul tortured with shame, and overwhelmed with hopeless sorrow—with no sympathy—no pity—no kind hand to wipe his burning tears—I say again, would that my own heart felt his sufferings more. They cry to us for pity and for relief. And besides their general appeal to the humanity of every human being, they have a special claim on the sympathy and aid of American Christians, from the fact that men professing to be Christian, have largely contributed to produce these sufferings. Who that has a heart to feel can think of this and not be prompted by all that is within him to lend his aid and hearty co-operation to those who, through evil report and good report are doing what in them lies to break his bonds. It is bad enough to reflect on human suffering when inflicted immediately by the hand of Providence—to look upon woes which we have no hand in causing—but as we contemplate the intolerable woes of the slave, the killing thought comes up into the mind, that it is we who bound the heavy burden upon him. And sadder than all, it is to think that the Church of Jesus Christ has a deep and dark share in this crimson iniquity. Do you ask how? I answer, by not preventing it. To partake of sin—to further sin—nay, to beget and produce and be the parents of iniquity—you have only to sit still and do nothing. If you would push onward the car of pure religion in the world, you must be up and doing—you must row up stream—and row without pause or intermission. You have only to refuse to touch an oar, and to lay your hands upon those who are rowing, and you cause the boat to go down stream as fast as the rushing current of cupidity and cruelty can carry it. Slavery, in all its forms, is the result of cupidity, and cruelty is its inseparable companion. What is it that the slaveholder wants of a Christian? He is about to do a deed of darkness: he does not ask the church to hold him, but only to hold a torch while he is doing it, so that he may be able to say it was not a deed of darkness. And this is what the church has done. Now he can say that so far from stealing away into the shade like a guilty thing, he did what he did under the full blaze of Christianity—before the very altar of God. Consent has been asked of the guardians of truth and righteousness, and it has been had and obtained. Suppose it had been a murder that he was about to perpetrate, and the church had lent its implied sanction to the work and held out its light while he did it, the very same act would hang the church as *particeps criminis*—an accessory before the fact. And where is the difference?

She is "art and part" with the slaveholder. She opens her doors to receive him, she extends to him her hand, and affords him a home and a resting place. But let the church do her duty—let her raise her testifying voice throughout the land—let her hold up her light in the darkness, and show to Jacob his sin and to Israel his transgression—and what will be the result? How soon would hell-born slavery skulk away into its native darkness, and every slaveholder, as ashamed, hang his head! But, no: it must not be done. A minority of the church cries—"be still"—"say nothing." Sir, it afflicts me: It pains my heart. I am humbled when I behold free men of the North manufacturing apologies for southern slaveholders. I say that the church of Jesus Christ has been aiding and abetting this crying iniquity. I say that it is we, we, who profess and call ourselves Christians, it is we who have caused those very groans of the slave which cry unto God like Abel's blood, and hence it is that I have boldly affirmed that the sufferings of the enslaved are peculiar—there is no sorrow like unto their sorrow.

Again, his sufferings are peculiar in this: that they are, more than any other, within reach of Christian sympathy and aid. There are sufferings among the petty tribes on the wide plains of Africa—sufferings among the poor Hottentots at her southern extremity—sufferings over the extended face of a sim-blighted and groaning world; but are they so in reach of our arm—so beneath our very eyes, as the sufferings of the slave? True, the laws of the southern States forbid us to visit the scene; they throw their protection not over the slave but over his oppressor. I know it, but I say that the Church of God is stronger than all governments and all laws of this earth. Arm themselves, or shield themselves as the workers of iniquity may, the Jerusalem blade can pierce through all their covering, and cut in sunder every opposing weapon. The government may rear up mountains in our way, but we can assail mountains and pull them down. Our Master has said that faith can remove mountains and cast them into the sea. A man may be so poor as not to have a dollar in his purse, and yet have influence in heaven. He can go into his closet, and by his prayers and tears can move the hand that moves the world. And where is the Christian so poor that he cannot speak a word for the poor slave? Mighty is the truth, and it will prevail. Sir, I greatly doubt whether we have viewed this matter as we should.—Some of us, it is true, have spoken, and spoken to our cost; and where we cannot reach the slave in person, God may open the way for our testimony, and carry it to his master. But I hold that, if all other means fail, the day may yet come, when we shall be called to take our lives in our hands and go and preach to these men. I know it will be immediately said, that this will never do—that we shall certainly lose our lives. Well,—admit it: and suppose that five hundred pious and resolute Christian ministers at the North shall find it laid upon their hearts to go and declare truth in the ears of oppression; and the southern slaveholder shall pour out their blood: what then? How many do ye suppose would thus fall before the country would be awakened from its lethargy to the magnitude of this iniquity? It is possible that this may be the very sacrifice to which we are called before the blessing of God shall descend in floods, as in the days of Elijah. I have thought much on this subject. I do not read that the apostles of the Saviour had much to do with the will of the governments of this world. When forbidden to teach or preach in the name of Jesus they went straightway and preached Jesus in the temple, and the rulers came and caught them at it: and what was the result? Their blood was shed upon the ground,—but what did it prove? The seed of the church. It was the very thing that was wanted to open the way for the glorious triumphs of truth. Slaveholders have not seen this sight. They have never seen men who loved the cause of the slave better than their own lives, coming and laying down their lives freely in

that cause. Let them see it. Let the McDuffies, and the Calhouns, and all the other advocates of the "heaven-descended institution," see a Christian minister full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, meekly taking his way to the quarter, or to the cotton-field, to preach to the poor toiling slave. No doubt they would instantly arrest his steps, and ask, "Where are you going?" "I am going to preach the gospel of God to five hundred immortal men I see laboring yonder." "But stop, sir; those are my men; you cannot go there; if you attempt it it will be your death." "Well, if it is, I cannot help it, but go I must and do my duty." Let him see such a sight on his plantation, and it will do more than all else to open his eyes and reach his heart. I speak no chimera. I only speak of what may one day be seen in this land, and possibly at no very distant day neither. Such an object is worth dying for. And suppose that I myself shall be one of the number thus called;—sure I am that if the church which I serve shall say that it is my duty to go, the next day will find me on my way to the South. And suppose I should die there, what then? By my guilty apathy in the cause of human freedom a hundred poor slaves may have already died; and death hurt their flesh as badly as it will mine, and possibly worse; while their poor souls may have been in a far worse condition. On me the lamp of life has shined, while its light has been hidden from their eyes. In this cause southern Christians and northern Christians are alike appealed to—and on the ground of our common Christianity. And the appeal comes endorsed, too, by our country's weal. As Americans we are red in the blood of victims. Our iniquities have reached unto heaven: and the judgments of God are gathering fast over our guilty land. Have we nothing to fear from that arm that shook Egypt and threshed Babylon, and takes up the isles as a very little thing? As he is mighty to protect, so is Jehovah strong to destroy. What human power can destroy us? The nations of the old world may array themselves in vain; but let us tremble before him who makes Assyria his rod, and shakes it as the saw in his hand. Base, time-serving corruption in the church is making our strength as rottenness. The church has already felt the shock—her foundations are moved. And our country—where is she? to which of all her legislative halls will you go and not find that the tongues of her orators have ceased to speak of judgment? Who has listened to the debates in Congress and heard how our statesmen speak of the Indian tribes, of the faith of treaties, of the trifling with the national flag and the sanctity of a truce,—and has not felt his flesh shudder and his soul quake within him lest the pillars of our national greatness should crumble into dust, and the last hope of the world for freedom sink beneath their ruins? God is sounding the truth into our ears: his rod is lifted up; and how shall we escape the descending blow? Will iniquity ever begin its own reformation? do we look to our politicians for health? Vain, vain is all such confidence. It is the church, the church, that is the salt of the earth. God has commanded a world's reformation to the hands of his own children. Why then do we slumber? Let us arouse ourselves from our long sleep of wicked indifference, and put our hands to the work, and God will scatter light in all our paths. If the nation is ever to be saved, it is the saints that must save her. And while slavery lives her salvation is far off.

I know that there is a saying, stereotyped and ready for use, to meet the force of this argument—it rings from the pulpit and the press—"Christians have nothing to do with politics." And under its benumbing power, Christians have stood aside, and fallen back—and let the ear of God's cause drive downward to ruin. Not a hand has been lifted, not a mouth opened. Christians must neither act nor even speak. Christians have nothing to do with politics. Yet with this motto in their mouths, Christians have had to do, had much to do, with politics. They have knuckled and truckled to injury: members of

Christ have vindicated the wrong and suffered righteousness to fall in the streets. They have not only not aided the friends of the slave, but they have thwarted and resisted them. An old and experienced minister has lately written an elaborate essay in vindication of the course of the Government toward our aborigines, and the very same press which had been loudest in denouncing ministers for meddling with the abolition cause as a matter wholly secular and out of their sphere, instantly saluted him with a round of applause—so it seems there is no objection to Christians and ministers having to do with politics, provided always that it is on the wrong side. Now I say that Christians can do much, and ought to do much for their country. I say that they are bound to come up as one man and put an end to the shuffling policy which the church has pursued on the subject of slavery. The cries of the suffering slave demand it at our hands. The voice of Providence warns us against longer delay. The remonstrances of conscience within second the language of the Bible without, and all conspire to say—“undo the heavy burdens—break every yoke—do unto others as ye would they should do unto you.”

But while I say that this cause stands foremost in its demands upon the church, I mean not to be understood as holding, for a moment, that the Tract, and Bible, and Education, and Mission causes are to be abandoned. Far from it. But while two men need our help, but one of them is in prison and the other at liberty, we are first called to loose the prisoner. Then let us up and do it. In preaching, in prayer-meetings, wherever and whenever Christians meet, let us neither be ashamed or afraid to put the cause of the slave foremost. Its claim is paramount—and as such, let it receive our first thoughts, our first and most devoted labors and prayers.

The meeting was closed with the Doxology,

“From all that dwell below the skies,”

and the apostolical benediction. A large assembly crowded the spacious Tabernacle, and listened for four hours with silent and unabated interest.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

At a meeting of the Board of Managers of the American Anti-Slavery Society, held at Chatham-street chapel, 5th mo. (May) 9th, 1839.

Francis Jackson, one of the Vice Presidents, took the chair, and Wm. Bassett, was appointed Secretary.

The Board then proceeded to the election of an Executive Committee for the ensuing year, and the following gentlemen were duly elected, *viz* :—

ARTHUR TAPPAN,	JAMES G. BIRNEY,
JOHN RANKIN,	S. E. CORNISH,
LEWIS TAPPAN,	DUNCAN DUNBAR,
S. S. JOCELYN,	LA ROY SUNDERLAND,
JOSHUA LEAVITT,	HENRY B. STANTON,
THEODORE S. WRIGHT,	JAMES S. GIBBONS.

Attest, Wm. Bassett, Sec'y.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
HELD, FOR THE TRANSACTION OF BUSINESS,
AT THE CHATHAM STREET CHAPEL, NEW-YORK,

On the 7th of May, and the three following days, 1839.

The Annual Meeting for business was held at the Chatham-street Chapel, on Tuesday, May 7, at four o'clock, P. M.

In the absence of the President, WILLIAM R. WEEKS, D. D., of New Jersey, the first Vice President who was present was called to the chair.

STEPHEN STANLEY, of N. Y., WILLIAM BASSETT, and GEORGE RUSSELL, of Mass., and ROBERT PURVIS, of Pa., were appointed Secretaries.

On motion, it was

“Resolved, That the Secretaries be a Committee to make up the roll.”

Nathaniel Colver, of Washington Co., N. Y., moved, that o'er roll shall be made up, according to former usage, and *men*, duly appointed, shall constitute the roll.

Oliver Johnson, of Boston, moved an amendment, substituting the word *persons* for *men*.

After discussion on the amendment, but before the question was taken, the Society adjourned, to meet (in consequence of a pre-engagement of the chapel) in the church at the corner of Frankfort and William streets.

TUESDAY EVENING.

The Society met, pursuant to adjournment. GERRIT SMITH, of New York, a Vice President, in the chair.

Opened with prayer by Henry Grew, of Pa.

On motion of William Lloyd Garrison,

“Resolved, That no person be allowed to speak twice on this subject, until all others desiring it, shall have spoken; and no person shall speak more than ten minutes at a time without leave of the Society.”

The consideration of Mr. Colver's resolution, with Mr. Johnson's amendment, was resumed.

After full debate, the amendment was adopted by a large majority.

The resolution was then put to vote, and carried.

Lewis Tappan called for the yeas and nays, and the call was seconded by many members—but before they were called, the Society adjourned, to meet at the Chatham street Chapel, at 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, May 8, 1839.

The Society met, pursuant to adjournment. GERRIT SMITH in the chair. Opened with prayer by Joshua Leavitt, of N. J.

On motion of J. Leavitt,

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed, consisting of a chairman and of a member from each State represented, to report on the business to be acted on by the Society at this meeting, and to report the rules of proceeding of this meeting."

E. G. Loring, Mass. ; A. Sewart, N. Y. ; I. Codding, Me. ; S. D. Darling, N. H. ; E. D. Barber, Vt. ; W. M. Chace, R. I. ; Horace Cowles, Ct. ; G. W. Finney, N. J. ; C. C. Burleigh, Penn. ; John Rankin, Ohio ; F. W. Graves, Illinois ; W. Isham, Michigan ; C. W. Denison, Delaware ; A. A. Phelps, Mass. were appointed this committee.

The resolution under action last evening came up for debate this morning, by general consent.

A reconsideration of the vote deciding that all *persons* be admitted to act with this body, was carried.

On motion of Lewis Tappan, it was voted to take the yeas and nays on this resolution.

Ellis Gray Loring offered the following amendment:

Strike out all after the word Resolved, and insert.

"That the roll of this meeting be made by placing thereon the names of all persons, male and female, who are delegates from any auxiliary society, or members of this Society."

Amos A. Phelps moved the following amendment to the amendment, as a substitute for that of Mr. Loring.

"That the term 'person,' as used in the 4th Article of the Constitution of this Society, is to be understood as including men and women, and as entitling women to sit, speak, vote, hold office, and exercise the same rights of membership as persons of the other sex."

After debate, it was voted that the question should be taken at one o'clock. The debate continued until one o'clock, at which hour the amendment of Amos A. Phelps was rejected, and the amendment of Ellis Gray Loring was carried. The question was then taken by yeas and nays, on the resolution, as amended, and carried as follows:

"Resolved, That the roll of this meeting be made by placing thereon the names of all persons, male and female, who are delegates from any auxiliary society, or members of this society."

MAINE.

*Yea*s.—C. L. Remond.—1.

*Nay*s.—Iehabod Codding, J. Underwood, D. B. Randall, C. Cone, Ebenezer Dole, Ebenezer Dole, jr.—6.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

*Yea*s.—C. C. Chase.—1.

*Nay*s.—N. B. Warner, S. D. Darling, Silas Curtis, J. Perkins, Wm. H. Brewster.—5.

VERMONT.

*Yea*s.—James Dean, J. Holcomb, C. L. Knapp, R. T. Robinson, Benjamin F. Haskell—5.

*Nay*s.—Daniel Roberts, J. W. Hale, W. C. Denison, E. D. Barber—4.

RHODE ISLAND.

*Yea*s.—Mary E. Chase, Abel Tanner, Wm. Adams, Thomas Davis, George L. Clarke, Daniel Mitchell, William Euffum, James C. Crawford, Nancy L. Brayton, Alphonso R. James—10.

*Nay*s.—Wm. Tanner—1.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Yea.—Ellis Gray Loring, Elijah Bird, Wendell Phillips, Eliza Barney, Eliza Nicholson, C. T. Bagley, Stillman Lothrop, N. H. Whiting, Amos Farnsworth, Luther Boutelle, Asa Bronson, Wm. Lewis, Joseph Southwick, Harris Cowdrey, Clarissa Lawrence, Moses Wilmarth, Anne Warren Weston, Thankful Southwick, Mary C. Frye, Wm. Bassett, Michael R. Brown, Samuel Philbrick, Jacob Noyes, Rodney French, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Dexter Dickinson, Deborah J. Henshaw, Abner Sanger, Oliver Johnson, H. C. Wright, Charles Davies, Geo. Bradburn, Abby Kelly, J. A. Collins, John S. Hall, John T. Hilton, Henry A. Farnsworth, Ezra C. Smith, J. B. Pierce, Wm. R. Chapman, Edmund Jackson, Francis Jackson, Ezekiel Hale, jr. John Jones, Simeon Collins, John N. Barbour, G. W. F. Mellen, Hannah Buffum, Harvey Chase, Benj. P. Bassett, Wm. P. Powell, Samuel W. King, Nathan Johnson, Thomas P. Ryder, Josiah Hayward, Benjamin Hall, Samuel Reed, Daniel Henshaw, James P. Boyce, Wm. B. Oliver, Christopher Robinson, John W. Browne, P. R. Russell, Wm. Ashby, W. B. Burley, Thomas Cole, John Parkman, Otis Thompson, Sarah G. Buffum, N. B. Borden, C. P. Grosvenor, L. Woodbury.—72.

Nay.—Sewall Harding, Phineas Crandall, Israel Trask, R. B. Hubbard, Geo. Russell, Geo. Goodyear, Harper Boice, Samuel Osgood, S. H. Emery, Charles T. Torrey, Geo. H. Smith, A. A. Phelps, Bucklin Fitts, O. Scott, D. Butler, D. W. Alvord, Joseph Hurlbut, John E. Fuller, George Allen, James Birney, jr., S. S. Smith, T. E. Turner, J. A. Canfield, Thomas W. Ward, Nathl. Colver.—25.

CONNECTICUT.

Yea.—Jonathan Leonard, Samuel Denning, George W. Benson, Asa Curtis, D. Plumb, Horace Cowles, William Bolles, A. F. Williams, Francis Hawley, Charles Fairman, Erasmus D. Hudson, Sherman M. Booth, P. Loveridge, John Turney.—14.

Nay.—F. A. Perkins, Julius Pratt, Randolph Lindsley, James Averill, A. G. Beman, A. C. Luca, Chas. P. Bush, Lewis Bars, George Hall, W. L. Wilson, James Quintard.—11.

NEW-YORK.

Yea.—R. P. G. Wright, H. V. Teall, Phillip Firman, Nathan Blount, J. C. Delong, Richard P. Huat, Thomas McClatchock, Samuel Thompson, William P. Green, Augustus Beach, Stephen Angell, Fordyce Rice, Alvan Stewart, J. H. Murray, T. O. Buckmaster, J. N. Knowles, A. Hawley, Charles B. Ray, John Cross, J. Rhodes, G. Grant, J. P. Clarke, Henry Frost, Esther Carpenter, Isaac Post, Isaac Pierce, Samuel Welles, Benjamin Fish, A. Doolittle, John Hopper, Abel B. Burke, Henry W. Davison, Hammon Pimney, James C. Fuller, Gerrit Smith, W. L. Chaplin, J. T. Raymond, Reuben Sleeper, Sarah E. Pierce, John Rhodes, George Cragin, John Brown, David Ruggles, Henry A. Garnet, John Robinson.—45.

Nay.—Abraham Requa, Anthony Lane, G. H. Williams, James Hildreth, Asa Bennett, E. T. Ball, Edward C. Pritchett, James Westervelt, H. W. Norton, Augustus Wilcox, E. S. Lane, J. M. Sherwood, James G. Birney, James Wallen, S. Stanley, E. A. Lambert, Asa W. Bushnell, William Patton, Jr., Robert Aikman, Jr., N. E. Johnson, G. N. Parburt, G. Bailey, John Jay, Sumner Davidson, O. R. Bush, R. R. Kellogg, George M. Tracy, Wm. T. Coolidge, D. Willson, A. O. Wilcox, Roe Lockwood, W. S. Dorr, Peter Williams, S. W. Benedict, Augustus J. Gillett, Frederick James, Fayette Shipherd, Lyman W. Gilbert, A. Libolt, Hezekiah H. Loomis, Selden Haynes, John Cromwell, R. G. Murray, E. E. Miles, Theodore McNamee, James McCune Smith, M. N. Niles, Guy Davis, George Storrs, Clark Lockwood, Amos Savage, Henry H. Loomis, Beriah Green, Lewis Tappan, Duncan Dunbar, G. G. Merriweather, John Low, Hiram Barney, H. H. Kellogg, E. W. True, C. B. Hatch, Darius E. Jones, Christopher Rush, Lewis C. Lockwood, Mrs. G. M. Tracy, Lucy Denning, La Roy Sunderland, C. Kenmore, Joshua Bishop, H. C. Bowen, Thomas L. Jennings, James G. Barbour, Wm. E. Whiting, Thomas Downing, H. D. Sharpe, James H. French.—76.

NEW JERSEY.

Yea.—J. Leavitt, G. W. Finney, Alex. N. Dougherty, James W. Higgins,

James Howe, Joseph Parish, Jr., Stephen Grimes, Swain A. Condit, Aaron Pearson.—9.

Nays.—A. M. Torbet, Wm. R. Weeks.—2.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Yea.—Alexander Sweany, George Sellers, Moses Thacher, Sam'l M'Farland, Joshua L. Hallowell, Henry Peterson, Thomas F. Cavender, Stephen H. Gloucester, Edwin H. Coates, Robert Purvis, Lewis C. Gunn, Joseph L. Pennock, Mahlon Linton, John G. Whittier, Samuel Webb, C. C. Burleigh, Joseph Healy, Daniel Neall, Jr., Thomas Earle, Sam'l Tyson, Arnold Buffum.—21.

Nays.—Samuel D. Hastings, Charles W. Gardiner, Wm. Adair, F. Julius Le Moigne, Henry Grew, Andrew Harris, George M. Alsop.—7.

DELAWARE.

Nay.—C. W. Denison.—1.

OHIO.

Yea.—Isaac Colby, John Rankin.—2.

ILLINOIS.

Nays.—F. W. Graves, G. W. Gale.—2.

RECAPITULATION.

	Ayes.	Nays.
Maine,	1	6
New Hampshire,	1	5
Vermont,	5	4
Massachusetts,	72	25
Rhode Island,	10	1
Connecticut,	14	11
New-York,	45	76
New Jersey,	9	2
Pennsylvania,	21	7
Delaware,		1
Ohio,	2	
Indiana,		
Illinois,		2
Michigan,		

Total of Ayes, 180.

Total of Nays, 140.

Majority 40.

ROLL

Of Members and Delegates, attending the Sixth Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, held in the City of New-York, on the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th days of May, A. D. 1839.

MAINE.

Ichabod Codding and C. L. Remond, agents of the Maine A. S. Society.

Hallowell, D. B. Randall, H. T. Cheever, Ebenezer Dole, E. Dole, Jr.

Brunswick, C. Cone.

Bangor, J. W. Mason.

East Machias, T. T. Stone.

New Sharon, James Underwood.—10.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Milford, N. B. Warner.

Gilmanton, S. D. Darling.

Derry, William H. Brewster.

Nashua, Silas Curtis, J. Perkins.

Dart. Coll., Benj. Comings, C. C. Chase.—7.

VERMONT.

Brandon, J. W. Hale, J. Holcomb.
Burlington, James Dean.
Charlotte, Charles Grant.
Cornwall, Benjamin F. Haskell.
Hubbardton, W. C. Dennison.
Middlebury.—E. D. Barber, —— Crane.
Montpelier, C. L. Knapp, Henry Barnes.
North Ferrisburg, Rowland T. Robinson.
Manchester, Daniel Roberts, Jr.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Boston, Ellis Gray Loring, Wendell Phillips, C. F. Bagley, William Lewis, Joseph Southwick, Anne Warren Weston, Thankful Southwick, Michael R. Brown, Jacob Noyes, Benj. P. Bassett, Alanson St. Clair, Benjamin Hall, W. A. Burley, Thomas Cole, Mary A. W. Johnson, George Russell, William Lloyd Garrison, Dexter Dickinson, Oliver Johnson, H. C. Wright, Charles Davis, John B. Person, John S. Hall, John T. Hilton, Edmund Jackson, Francis Jackson, Amos A. Phelps, G. W. F. Mellen, J. S. Hall, John E. Fuller, Nath'l Colver.

Abington, Samuel Reed.
Arlon, Harris Cowdrey.
Adams, William H. Pettell.
Amherst, J. S. Kidder, George M. Tuthill, George W. Ash.
Andover, J. A. Collins, Ezra C. Smith, W. R. Chapman, James Birney, Jr., T. E. Turner, J. A. Canfield.
Ashburnham, George Goodyear.
Attlebury, Morris Wilmarth.
Beverly, Israel Trask, John J. Baker.
Brookline, Samuel Philbrick.
Cambridgeport, A. H. Safford, J. W. Parker, John N. Barbour.
Charlestown, Josiah Brackett.
Curtisville, Joseph Hurlbut.
Dalton, Harper Boice.
Danvers, Samuel W. King, Abner Sanger, J. B. Pierce.
Dorchester, Daniel Butler, Josiah V. Marshall.
East Bridgewater, Thomas P. Rider.
Full River, Phineas Crandall, Asa Bronson, Harvey Chase, Sarah G. Buffum, N. B. Borden.
Graton, Amos Farnsworth, Luther Boutelle, Henry A. Farnsworth.
Greenfield, John Parkman, D. W. Alvord.
Haverhill, Ezekiel Hale, Jr.
Holliston, Bucklin Fitts.
Lynn, William Bassett, Hannah Buffum, Jonathan Buffum, Daniel Henshaw, James P. Boyce, William B. Oliver, Christopher Robinson, John W. Browne, Philemon R. Russell, Deborah S. Henshaw.
Lowell, William S. Merrill, Orange Scott.
Manchester, L. Woodbury.
Marshfield, N. H. Whiting.
Medway, Scwall Harding.
Millbury, Abby Kelly.
Nantucket, Eliza Barney, Eliza Nicholson, George Bradburn.
New Bedford, Andrew Bobeson, Samuel Rodman, Jr., Rodney French, W. P. Powell, Nathan Johnson.
Newburyport, William Ashby.
Northampton, R. B. Hubbard, Charles Wiley.
Peru, Joseph Knight.
Quincy, Daniel Wise.
Rehoboth, Otis Thompson.
Roxbury, John Jones, S. S. Smith.
Salem, Clarissa Lawrence, Mary C. Frye, Josiah Hayward, Charles T. Torrey, George H. Smith.

Shrewsbury, George Allen, T. W. Ward.
Springfield, Samuel Osgood.
Taunton, Elijah Bird, S. H. Emery, Jonathan Hodges.
Watertown, Stillman Lathrop.
Westfield, Simeon Collins.
Worcester, C. P. Grosvenor.—118.

RHODE ISLAND.

Providence, Mary E. Chace, Hiram Brooks, Thomas Davis, Geo. L. Clarke, William Buffum, Janies C. Crawford, Sarah Pratt, Alphonso R. Jones.
Pawtucket, William Adams, Daniel Mitchell, Nancy L. Brayton.
Warwick, Abel Tanner, William Tanner.—13.

CONNECTICUT.

Norwich, Francis A. Perkins, George B. Ripley, A. L. Whitman.
Meriden, Julius Pratt, Randolph Linsley, Jonathan Leonard.
Farmington Samuel Deming, Horace Cowles, A. F. Williams.
Deep River, George Reed, H. Wooster.
Brooklyn, George W. Benson.
Yale Col. Theol. Sem., Charles P. Bush, James Averill, Sherman M. Booth.
Stratford, Asa Curtis, Lewis Beers, Jr.
Norfield, George Hall.
New Haven, A. G. Beman, A. C. Luca, David Plum.
Hartford, William Bolles, D. Chichester, A. M. Collins, Daniel Burgess.
Middletown, J. G. Baldwin, Amos Beckwith, W. L. Wilson.
Litchfield, Francis Hawley.
Newtown, Charles Fairman.
Torrington, Erasmus D. Hudson.
Norwalk, James Quintard.
Darien, Ezra D. Kinney.
Weston, P. Loveridge, John Turney.—35.

NEW-YORK.

New-York City, E. W. Chester, Anthony Lane, James H. French, Geo. H. Williams, James M. Hildreth, D. H. Sands, Stephen Angell, Robert Aikman, Hester Lane, James Westervelt, H. W. Norton, Augustus Wilcox, Mrs. E. S. Lane, T. O. Buckmaster, Nathl. Southard, George T. Downing, Asa Parker, Alexander Crummell, James G. Birney, James Wallin, H. B. Stanton, Alfred Smith, N. E. Johnson, G. R. Parburt, E. A. Lambert, John W. Hill, Thomas Van Raenslaer, Charles B. Ray, William Patton, Jr., Robert Aikman, Jr., James S. Gibbons, Lewis Tappan, O. W. Norton, John Jay, A. Cleaveland Cox, H. D. Sharpe, — Van Pelt, Edwin Wilcox, Samuel Leeds, Waters Warren, Edward P. Clarke, Isaac Pierce, George M. Tracy, William T. Coolidge, Adrastus Doolittle, John Hopper, A. O. Wilcox, Roe Leckwood, William S. Dorr, Peter Williams, Abel B. Burke, S. W. Benedict, Augustus J. Gilbert, Charles Kellogg, Lyman W. Gilbert, A. Libolt, H. H. Loomis, John Cromwell, Henry W. Davison, E. E. Miles, Theo. McNamee, James M'Cune Smith, George Storrs, S. S. Jocelyn, Duncan Dunbar, J. T. Raymond, G. Merriweather, J. T. Smith, B. Bowen, W. J. Hodges, J. P. Turney, D. Copeland, Hiram Barney, C. B. Hatch, Darius E. Jones, Christopher Rush, Mrs. G. M. Tracy, Lucy Denning, La Roy Sunderland, Theodore S. Wright, Sarah E. Pierce, Charles Kenmore, Silas Jessup, Geo. Cragin, Joshua Bishop, Elizur Wright, Jr., George D. Little, H. C. Bowers, Patrick Reason, John Brown, David Ruggles, Thomas L. Jinnings, Thomas Varnum, Jr., Henry H. Garnet, James G. Barbour, Thomas Ritter, Abigail H. Gibbons, Thomas Downing, S. D. Burehard.

Ulica, J. C. Delong, Luther Lee, Edward C. Pritchett, Alvan Stewart, Amos Savage, R. G. Williams, W. L. Chaplin.

Poughkeepsie, Nathan Blount, Abraham Regno, Samuel Thompson, A. Underwood, J. P. Clarke, Henry Frost, John Low, John W. Sleight.

Schenectady, John P. Beckey, R. P. G. Wright, H. V. Teall, Philip Furnam, J. H. Hayes.

Brooklyn, R. R. Kellogg, Arthur Tappan, N. E. Whitney, Edward Corning,
 William E. Whitney.
Waterloo, Richard P. Hunt, Thomas M'Clintock, Charles T. Freebody.
Albany, David Scott.
Newburgh, J. M. Sherwood, James R. Willson, J. W. Knevels, Samuel C.
 Griffin, John Caughey.
Troy, John Robinson, Gurdon Grant, John Rhodes, Fayette Shipherd, P. F.
 Ballmore, J. H. Gardner.
Rochester, Philip Thurber, O. N. Bush, H. B. Shearman, Isaac Post, John
 Park, Benjamin Fish.
Johnstown, Gurdon C. Judson, J. H. Murry, Darius Wells.
Whitesboro, Beriah Green, Thomas Beebe, Dudley Bartlett.
Union Village, G. Bailey, Leonard Gibbs.
Owego, P. B. Peck, B. B. Curry, Harman Pinney.
Morrisville, R. A. Williams, Milton Barnet.
Peterboro, Gerrit Smith.
Ballston Spa, William P. Green.
Oppenheim, Augustus Beach.
Homer, Asa Bennett.
Cincinnatus, E. T. Ball.
Cazenoria, Fordyce Rice.
Auburn, Josiah Hopkins, Stephen Stanley.
Skeneateles, James C. Fuller.
Catskill, Philander Gould.
Elmira, John Frost.
Clinton, H. H. Kellogg.
Pittsford, E. W. True.
Mountmorris, Reuben Sleeper.
New Windsor, Lewis C. Lockwood.
Chittenango, Guy Davis.
Maltaville, Clark Lockwood.
Rensselaerville, J. Lane.
Albion, John Keen.
New Rochelle, Esther Carpenter.
Cuba, Sumner Davidson.
Oriskany, Samuel Wells.
Brockport, Lewis L. Peet.
Marcellus, A. C. Lathrop.
Colchester, Frederick James.
Perry, Selden Haynes.
Henrietta, R. G. Murray.
Pen Yan, Henry Bradley.
Newstead, M. N. Miles.
Syracuse, Josiah Wright.
Courtland, William Elder.
Jamesstown, A. Hawley.
Livingstonville, Asa W. Bushnell.—186.

NEW JERSEY.

Newark, Alexander N. Dougherty, John A. Pain, Abraham Miller, Abraham
 O. King, Stephen Grimes, William R. Weeks, William F. Gardener.
Paterson, A. M. Torbet, S. W. Buffum.
Bloomfield, Joshua Leavitt, Aaron Pearson.
West Bloomfield, Geo. W. Finney.
Jersey City, James W. Higgins, James Howe.
Boonton, Swain A. Condit.
Burlington, Joseph Parish, jr.—16.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Philadelphia, Samuel D. Hastings, Charles W. Gardner, Joshua L. Hal-
 lowell, Henry Peterson, Thomas S. Cavendar, Henry Grew, Joshua Coffin,

Samuel Nickless, Stephen H. Gloucester, Andrew Harris, Robert Purvis, Edwin H. Coates, George M. Alsop, John G. Whittier, Samuel Webb, C. C. Burleigh, Joseph Healey, Daniel Neall, Jr., Thomas Earle, Arnold Buffum.

Western Pennsylvania, William A. Adair, Samuel McFarland, F. Julius Le Moyne.

Delaware County, George Sellers, Lewis C. Gunn, John Sellers, jr., Joseph Lyddon Pennock.

Wayne Co., Moses Thacher, Anthony M'Reynolds.

Bucks Co., Mahlon Linton.

Montgomery Co., Samuel Tyson.

Washington Co., Alexander Sweany.—32.

DELAWARE.

Wilmington, Charles W. Denison.—1.

OHIO.

Cincinnati, Isaac Colby.

Ripley, John Rankin.—2.

ILLINOIS.

Alton, Frederick W. Graves.

Galesburgh, George W. Gale.—2.

MICHIGAN.

Detroit, Warren Isham.—1.

RECAPITULATION.

States.	Delegates.
Maine,	10
New Hampshire,	7
Vermont,	12
Massachusetts,	118
Rhode Island,	13
Connecticut,	35
New York,	186
New Jersey,	16
Pennsylvania,	32
Delaware,	1
Ohio,	2
Illinois,	2
Michigan,	1
Total from 13 States	435

Lewis Tappan and Charles T. Torrey gave notice that they should protest against the allowance of women to vote in the meeting.

Amos A. Phelps offered the following resolution, seconded by La Roy Sunderland.

“Resolved, That in placing ‘the names of all persons, male and female, who are delegates from any auxiliary society, or members of this,’ on the roll of this or any subsequent meeting of this society, it is not to be understood that by the constitution and usage of the society, women are entitled to sit, speak, vote, hold office, and exercise the same rights of membership as persons of the other sex.”

The Society adjourned, to meet in this place at half-past three o’clock this afternoon.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON

The Society met according to adjournment. GERRIT SMITH, in the chair. Meeting opened with prayer by Moses Thacher, of Pa.

Orange Scott moved the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the editors of the different Anti-Slavery papers, throughout the country be requested to publish the resolution on making up the roll, with the yeas and nays and places of residence." Adopted.

On report of the Business Committee, the following resolutions were adopted :

"Resolved, That a Committee of three be appointed to audit the Treasurer's accounts."

Wendell Phillips, C. L. Knapp, and J. C. Fuller were appointed.

"Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to examine and report on the letters addressed to this meeting."

William L. Garrison, Eliza Burney, and C. L. Remond, were appointed.

"Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to examine and report on the expenses of the Society."

Francis Jackson, George W. Benson, and R. G. Williams, were appointed.

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to report on the character of the publications of the society, and whether any and what measures ought to be taken to extend their circulation and increase their usefulness."

J. G. Whittier, Abby Kelly, and John Frost, were appointed.

"Resolved, That a committee of one from each State, on Finance be appointed to consider and propose some mode of providing funds to sustain the Anti-Slavery cause."

The committee are, Samuel Webb, Pa.; A. Farnsworth, Mass.; C. W. Denison, Del.; W. L. Chaplin, N. Y.; J. W. Mason, Me.; J. Perkins, N. H.; T. Davis, R. I.; A. C. Luca, Conn.; J. Holcomb, Vt.; Isaac Colby, Ohio; W. Isham, Mich.; G. W. Gale, Ill.; M. Bufum, N. J.

"Ordered, That all resolutions, to be offered to the meeting, be presented through the Business Committee, and if they decline, in any case, reporting a resolution submitted to them, that the mover of it have leave to offer the same after the disposal of the business reported by the committee."

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed, consisting of one from each State represented, to nominate suitable persons for officers of this society for the ensuing year."

D. B. Randall, Maine; C. C. Chase, N. H.; B. F. Haskell, Vt.; S. Philbrick, Mass.; W. Adams, R. I.; F. A. Perkins, Conn.; R. G. Williams, N. Y.; W. R. Weeks, N. J.; L. C. Gunn, Penn.; C. W. Denison, Del.; J. Rankin, Ohio; F. W. Graves, Ill.; and W. Isham, Mich. were appointed.

"Resolved, That the committee of nominations be directed to report the names of nine persons to serve as a committee of arrangements for the National Anti-Slavery Convention, appointed to be held at Albany, on the 30th day of July next."

"Ordered, That no member be allowed by the Chair, without special leave of the meeting, to speak more than ten minutes, nor oftener than once upon each motion, until every other member, who wishes to address the meeting, has spoken."

"Resolved, That when we adjourn, we adjourn to meet at this place to-morrow morning, at half-past eight o'clock."

The resolution offered by Amos A. Phelps then came up.

On motion of Alvan Stewart, the previous question was taken and carried. The main question was then put, and the resolution of Mr. Phelps was lost. The Recording Secretary presented the report of the Executive Committee. After explanation respecting former practice,

On motion of William L. Garrison, voted that the annual report be now taken up, and so much of it read as relates to political action.

Select portions were read accordingly, by J. LEAVITT.

On motion of William Lloyd Garrison,

“Resolved, That the portion of the Report which treats of political action, be referred to a committee of one from each State represented.”

The following are the committee :

Messrs. Garrison of Massachusetts, Adams of Rhode Island, Barber of Vermont, Darling of New Hampshire, Perkins of Connecticut, Dole, Jr. of Maine, M'Clintock of New York, Leavitt of New Jersey, Earle of Pennsylvania, Denison of Delaware, Rankin of Ohio, Graves of Illinois, Isham of Michigan.

Certain resolutions on political action, reported by the Business Committee, were referred to the same committee.

On application from Mr. Barnes, for leave to record his vote on the resolution which was adopted this morning. Ellis Gray Loring moved that all whose names were on the roll at the time the yeas and nays were called, and who did not vote at that time, be allowed to record their vote.

On motion of J. C. Fuller, seconded by William L. Garrison, the subject was laid on the table.

Adjourned, to meet at this place at half-past eight o'clock, to-morrow morning.

THURSDAY MORNING, May 9, 1839.

The society met pursuant to adjournment. GERRIT SMITH in the chair.

Prayer was offered by James Howe, of N. J.

The Committee of Business reported the following resolution for consideration, which was accepted.

“Resolved, That the Executive Committee of this society shall not interfere directly or indirectly, by sending or employing agents or otherwise, in the conduct of the cause, in any State within which a State Society exists, without the assent of such Society.”

Gerrit Smith moved to amend it so as to read, That the Executive Committee shall not send or employ any agent within any State, within which a State society exists, without the assent of such society. The amendment was adopted.

The discussion was continued by A. A. Phelps, L. R. Sunderland, Joseph Hurlbut, E. C. Pritchett, Dr. Osgood, Daniel Neal, Jr., T. P. Rider, John Rankin, W. L. Chaplin, J. R. Wilson, and E. G. Loring.

W. L. Chaplin moved the following substitute, which was lost.

MR. CHAPLIN'S RESOLUTIONS.

“Resolved, That the slaveholding power of the South is countenanced and mainly upheld by the false views, on the subject of ‘human rights,’ cherished and carried out in legislation at the North—that a leading object of the Anti-Slavery enterprise is to correct these erroneous views, and to obtain a repeal of all legislative acts which, in their operation, are peculiarly oppressive and injurious to the coloured people; and that these objects can alone be attained by the systematic instruction and thorough conviction on the subject of their duties, as men and christians, of all classes of society.

“Resolved, That those arrangements which will most perfectly impose responsibility upon the individual officers and members of the National, State, county and local societies, and secure their constant and earnest endeavours in behalf of the objects to be subserved by our organization, will be the safest and most likely to attain the results at which we aim.

“Resolved, That the plan of independent State action agreed upon last year, if prosecuted with resolution and good faith by all parties concerned, is believed to be at once the most simple, efficient and satisfactory; and that it ought to be adopted, as the basis of future operations in the Anti-Slavery cause.”

John Rankin of Ohio, moved the indefinite postponement of the subject, which was debated by Messrs. Rankin, Bradburn, French, Gunn, Barber, and others.

“Resolved, That, when we adjourn it be to meet at half-past three o’clock this afternoon, at the church, corner of Frankfort and William streets.”

Gerrit Smith moved that the original resolution and all the motions connected therewith, be laid on the table, that he might offer a substitute. Carried.

Mr. Smith then offered the following :

“Resolved, That the Executive Committee of this society be earnestly invited, for the sake of securing the advantages of harmonious action, not to send into or employ any agent, within any State, within which a State society exists, without the assent of such society.”

C. C. Burleigh moved to substitute the word *instructed* for the words *earnestly invited*.—Withdrawn. The debate was continued by G. Smith, W. Phillips, Thomas Earle.

The subject was suspended to receive the report of the committee on nominations, which was accepted, and after amendment was adopted, as follows :

LIST OF OFFICERS FOR THE YEAR 1839—40.

PRESIDENT.

ARTHUR TAPPAN, OF NEW-YORK.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

JAMES APPLETON, Maine.
GEORGE KENT, New-Hampshire.
ROWLAND T. ROBINSON, Vermont
FRANCIS JACKSON, Massachusetts.
PELEG CLARKE, Rhode Island.
JOHN T. NORTON, Connecticut.
GERRIT SMITH, New-York.
SAMUEL AARON, New Jersey.
ABRAHAM L. PENNOCK, Pennsylvania.
LEICESTER KING, Ohio.
JOHN NEEDLES, Maryland.
ZIBA FERRIS, Delaware.
JAMES MORROW, Indiana.
DAVID NELSON, Illinois.
ROBERT STUART, Michigan.
ARTHUR THOME, Kentucky.
SAMUEL F. PHOENIX, Wisconsin Ter.
PETER VAN VLIET, Iowa Ter.

JAMES G. BIRNEY,
THEODORE D. WELD, } *Corresponding Secretaries.*
HENRY B. STANTON, }
JOSHUA LEAVITT, *Recording Secretary.*
JOHN RANKIN, *Treasurer.*

MANAGERS.

MAINE.

SAMUEL M. POND, CALVIN NEWTON, MOSES HILL, E. SOUTHWICK, GEORGE SHEPARD,	DAVID THURSTON, DANIEL B. RANDALL, SAMUEL HUTCHINS, NATHAN WINSLOW, SAMUEL FESSENDEN.
--	---

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

DAVID ROOT,
N. P. ROGERS,
DANIEL HOIT,

TIMOTHY K. BLAISDELL,
JARED PERKINS,
CALVIN CUTLER,
EDMUND J. WORTH.

VERMONT.

HARVEY F. LEAVITT,
E. D. BARBER,
LAWRENCE BRAINARD,
DANIEL ROBERTS, Jr.

J. W. HALE,
DAVID M. CAMP,
C. L. KNAPP,
O. S. MURRAY,

MERRITT BATES.

MASSACHUSETT'S.

WM. L. GARRISON,
WENDELL PHILLIPS,
EDMUND QUINCY,
AMASA WALKER,
AMOS FARNSWORTH,
PHENEAS CRANDALL,
NATHAN JOHNSON,

SAMUEL OSGOOD,
SAMUEL J. MAY,
ELLIS GRAY LORING,
A. A. PHELPS,
ORANGE SCOTT,
WILLIAM BASSETT,
C. P. GROSVENOR.

RHODE ISLAND.

JAMES EAMES,
WILLIAM ADAMS,

HENRY CUSHING,
JOHN G. CLARK,

WILLIAM BUFFUM.

CONNECTICUT.

ALEXANDER C. LUCA,
HORACE COWLES,
U. TUTTLE,

D. P. JAMES,
GEORGE W. BENSON,
LEICESTER A. SAWYER,
GEORGE READ.

NEW-YORK.

BERIAH GREEN,
WILLIAM L. CHAPLIN,
R. P. G. WRIGHT,
O. N. BUSH,
REUBEN SLEEPER,
N. E. JOHNSON,

ALVAN STEWART,
HENRY BREWSTER,
SAMUEL WELLS,
ELON GALUSHA,
C. W. DENISON,
JAMES C. FULLER.

S. W. BENEDICT.

NEW JERSEY.

JOHN GRIMES,
JAMES COOK,
JAMES WHITE,
J. W. HIGGINS,

A. N. DOUGHERTY,
JAMES PARKHURST,
N. P. THOMAS,
C. PELLOUBET.

PENNSYLVANIA.

J. G. WHITTIER,
THOMAS EARLE,
PETER WRIGHT,
F. J. LE MOYNE,
J. P. GAZZAM,
NATHAN STEM,
WILLIAM JESSUP,

JAMES FORTEN,
LEONARD FLETCHER,
ROBERT PURVIS,
WILLIAM A. ADAIR,
LINDLEY COATES,
DANIEL NEAL, Jr.
CHARLES W. GARDNER,

SAMUEL WEBB.

OHIO.

ROBERT STUART,
JAMES C. LUDLOW,
JOHN M. STEBLING,

JAMES GILLILAND,
WILLIAM W. BANCROFT,
ASA MAHAN

BENJAMIN STANTON,
WILLIAM DONALDSON,

GEORGE CAREY,
GEORGE WHIPPLE,
JOHN RANKIN.
INDIANA.

TIMOTHY SPAULDING,
SAMUEL DONALD, Sen.
HERBERT WILLIAMS,

LUKE MUNSELL,
JOHN SAILER,
WILLIAM TWINING.

ILLINOIS.

JAMES M. BUCHANAN,
JAMES H. DICKEY,
OWEN LOVEJOY,

BENJAMIN LUNDY,
GEORGE W. GALE,
EDWARD BEECHER.

DELaware.

SAMUEL BUZBY,
HURON JENKINGS,

HENRY GIBBONS,
SAMUEL M. GAYLEY.

MICHIGAN.

J. P. CLEVELAND,
WILLIAM KIRKLAND,

MARCUS HARRISON,
ARTHUR L. PORTER,
CHARLES HASTINGS.

WISCONSIN TERRITORY.

D. S. HOLLISTON,

NATHAN G. STORES,

IOWA TERRITORY.

ISAAC FIELD,

ASA TURNER, Jr.
LEWIS TAPPING.

The Society then adjourned, to meet at half past two o'clock instead of half past three.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

The Society met according to adjournment. GERRIT SMITH in the chair. Prayer was made by John Rankin of Ohio.

Lewis C. Gunn, by consent, introduced the following amendment to the resolution under debate.

"That the Executive Committee of this Society ought to send no agent into, nor employ any agent in a State where there is a state society, without the assent of such society; provided, that, if a request be sent, by a county or town society for an agent to labor among them, he may be sent, with instructions to confine his labors to such particular society or societies."

The debate was continued by A. St. Clair, C. C. Burleigh, T. P. Ryder, J. G. Birney, G. Smith, Beriah Green, L. C. Gunn, O. Scott, and J. Leavitt.

Lewis C. Gunn withdrew his amendment, which was renewed by Charles T. Torrey.

The question was taken on Mr. Torrey's amendment, and lost.

Mr. Leavitt moved to amend, by striking out the words, *the Executive Committee are invited not to send*, and insert the words, *the Society will not send*. Lost.

The resolution offered by Gerrit Smith, was adopted, as follows:

"Resolved that the Executive Committee are earnestly invited, for the sake of securing the advantages of harmonious action, not to send into or employ any agents in a State, within which a state society exists, without the assent of such society."

Mr. Garrison, from the Committee to whom was referred so much of the annual report as relates to political action, made their report as follows:

ON THE ANNUAL REPORT.

"Resolved, That the Executive Committee be requested to omit that part

of their report, contained between the 17th line on the 59th page, to the 17th line on the 60th page, as containing language liable to misconstruction: and that they be authorized to omit or verbally amend any other portion which they may see fit, and then to publish the said report as the sentiments of the Executive Committee.

ON POLITICAL ACTION.

1. "Resolved, That it is the duty of the American people, and especially of abolitionists, to endeavor to elect such men only to legislative and other official stations, as will advocate the repeal of every legal enactment by which the aid of the public authority is lent to the support of slavery.

2. "Resolved, That the temporary and repeated failures to attain the objects sought by abolitionists in petitioning and in voting at the polls for opponents of slavery, constitute no valid grounds for abandoning those measures; but we have full confidence that a steady perseverance in them will secure an ultimate triumph.

3. "Resolved, that in the original formation of this society, it was not contemplated, nor is it now desired to exclude from its membership any persons, on account of their being prevented by conscientious scruples, from participating in all the measures which the mass of the society, either originally or subsequently, may have contemplated as proper for the advancement of the Anti-Slavery cause."

The resolution on the annual report was taken up.

On motion of Joshua Leavitt, seconded by H. C. Wright, the question was divided. The first clause was taken up and discussed, and after explanation by members of the Committee, and discussion by several members, the whole resolution was then laid on the table.

Ellis Gray Loring then moved that the report of the Executive Committee be referred back to that Committee, with liberty to cause such portions of it to be printed, as the expression of their own sentiments, as they may choose.

This was discussed by Messrs. Lee, Garrison, R. G. Williams, C. C. Burleigh, and the amendment was carried.

R. G. Williams moved to amend, by striking out the words, *as the expression of their sentiments.* Lost.

C. C. Burleigh moved as a substitute—That the report be referred back to the Executive Committee, with instructions to prepare for publication a simple historical account of their doings, and the income, expenditures and funds of the society—which was debated by J. Leavitt, E. D. Barber, C. T. Torrey, H. C. Wright, E. G. Loring, Gerrit Smith, H. Grew, Dr. Rice, A. Buffum.

Gerrit Smith moved an alteration.

The previous question was then called and carried.

The previous question then recurred on Mr. Loring's motion, which was carried. A division being called for, there appeared for the motion 98, and against it 55. It is as follows:

"Resolved, that the report of the Executive Committee be referred back to that Committee, with liberty to cause such portions of it to be printed, as the expression of their own sentiments, as they may choose."

Wendell Phillips moved that this resolution be published immediately preceding the report, as well as among the proceedings of the Society.

Ellis Gray Loring moved that the rules be suspended for the purpose of receiving this motion without its passing through the Business Committee, pending which,

The society adjourned to meet in this place at half past seven o'clock this evening.

THURSDAY EVENING

The society met pursuant to adjournment. The President of the society it, the chair. Opened with prayer by Phineas Crandall.

Ellis Gray Loring withdrew his motion for a suspension of the rules. The Business Committee reported several resolutions, which were accepted and laid on the table.

The vote passed this day respecting the annual report, was reconsidered.

On motion of Henry B. Stanton, it was amended by striking out the words, *that committee*, and inserting the words, *the Executive Committee*.

On motion of N. B. Borden, the words, *of the last year*, were inserted after the word *Committee*, in the first line, and the word *present* before the words, *Executive Committee*, in the second line.

Joshua Leavitt moved to strike out all after the word *Committee* in the second line, and insert the words, *for revisal and publication*.

Mr. Ryder called for the previous question, which was lost.

The amendment was then put and carried.

Charles C. Burleigh moved to amend by adding the words, *as the expression of their opinions*.

The previous question was called for, but withdrawn.

After discussion by C. C. Burleigh, C. W. Gardner, and others,

C. T. Torrey moved that the resolution lie on the table. Lost.

The debate was continued by J. Leavitt, P. R. Russel, Amasa Walker, D. Neall, Jr., and Henry Grew, and the question was taken on Mr. Burleigh's amendment and carried.

The main question was then taken, and the resolution was adopted, as follows:

“Resolved. That the Report of the Executive Committee of last year, be referred to the present Executive Committee for revisal and publication, as the expression of their opinions.”

The Business Committee reported further resolutions, which were accepted and laid on the table.

The meeting was then adjourned to meet in this place at half past eight o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY MORNING, May 10, 1839.

The society met pursuant to adjournment. ROWLAND T. ROBINSON, one of the Vice Presidents, in the chair.

Mr. Garrison, from the Committee on Correspondence, reported, and the report was adopted, as follows:

“The Committee to whom was referred the letters addressed to the meeting, from abolitionists in various parts of the country, made a report, that these letters be referred to the Executive Committee, with instructions to publish such of them in the Emancipator as they shall think proper.”

Samuel Webb, from the Committee on Finance, reported three resolutions, as follows:

1. “Resolved, That be a committee to visit the philanthropists of Great Britain, and receive from them contributions to aid the Anti-Slavery cause in this country, and that the funds when received, (after deducting the expense of collection,) be paid into the treasury of this Society.

2. “Resolved, That the sum of thirty-two thousand five hundred dollars be raised for the use of this Society, by an equitable contribution among the several States.

3. “Resolved, That it be recommended to such auxiliary societies as are disposed to take the charge of the abolition cause within their respective fields, to make arrangements with the Executive Committee of this Society, guaran-

teeing to our treasury such stated payments as may be adjudged reasonable, and then assuming within their own limits the entire direction of lecturers and agents in forming local societies, collecting funds, circulating memorials, and establishing libraries; and that this Society will not send its agents to labor for these objects within the bounds of such auxiliaries as carry out this plan, except in concurrence with the Executive Committee of such auxiliaries."

The report was accepted, and the first resolution was taken up, and debated by J. C. Fuller, C. C. Burleigh, W. L. Chaplin, Abby Kelly, H. C. Wright, Isaac Pierce, D. Neall, Jr., G. W. Tinney.

E. D. Barber moved that the resolution be laid on the table. Carried.

Francis Jackson, one of the Vice Presidents, took the chair.

The second resolution was taken up, and debated by J. Holeomb, A. Stewart, J. Rankin, E. D. Barber, H. B. Stanton, S. Webb, W. Phillips, and J. G. Birney, and then, on motion J. G. Birney, was laid on the table.

The Auditing Committee reported, and their report was accepted.

The third resolution reported by the Finance Committee, was taken up and laid on the table.

The Business Committee reported the following resolution, which was accepted and laid on the table.

1. "Resolved that the sense of this society be taken on the following proposition—Can the Anti-Slavery cause be best conducted without any of the machinery of the American Anti-Slavery Society—solely by independent State action?"

The resolutions reported by Mr. Garrison on political action were then taken up. Mr. French moved to lay them on the table for the purpose of introducing a resolution, that the society will adjourn, *sine die*, at four o'clock this afternoon. Lost.

On motion of Oliver Johnson, seconded by William L. Garrison, the third resolution was taken up first.

A motion of James G. Birney to lay it on the table, was lost.

James G. Birney offered a substitute, which was cut off by the Previous Question.

The Previous Question was called by Oliver Johnson, and ordered, and the resolution, without amendment, was passed.

The first resolution was then taken up, and the previous question called by Wendell Phillips, and ordered. The resolution was then put and carried.

James G. Birney offered the following resolution, which had been submitted to the business Committee and by them refused to be presented.

"Resolved, That to maintain that the elective franchise ought not to be used by abolitionists to advance the cause of emancipation, is inconsistent with the duty of abolitionists under the constitution."

It was moved to lay it on the table.

Mr. Birney withdrew his resolution for the present.

The Business Committee presented the following resolution which was accepted and laid on the table.

"Resolved, As the sense of this society, that the annual reports of the Executive Committee be regarded solely as their own reports, and not as the reports of the American Society."

The following resolution was reported by the Business Committee.

"Resolved, That this society still holds, as it has from the beginning, that the employment of the political franchise, as established by the constitution and laws of the country, so as to promote the abolition of slavery, is of high obligation—a duty, which, as abolitionists, we owe to our enslaved fellow-countrymen groaning under legal oppression."

On motion of J. Leavitt, the report was accepted; and the resolution was debated by J. Leavitt, H. B. Stanton, C. C. Burleigh, G. Bradburn, J. G. Birney.

C. C. Burleigh offered as an amendment,

"That the abolitionist who regards it as his duty to use the elective franchise, and yet uses it against, or neglects to use it *for* the promotion of the cause of emancipation, is false to his own principles and clearly fails to do his duty."

Mr. Birney offered as an amendment the resolution he had before withdrawn.

The Committee on Nomination reported a list of names for the Committee of Arrangements of the National Convention, which was laid on the table.

The debate was continued by A. Walker, N. Colver, A. St. Clair, G. W. Benson, E. W. Chester, J. Frost, A. A. Phelps, W. Buffum.

The previous question was then called, and sustained, cutting off all the amendments.

The yeas and nays were called for, on the main question; and on a division, there appeared sixty-three in favor of the yeas and nays, and eighty in the negative. The chair decided that the call for the yeas and nays was sustained. An appeal was taken and withdrawn.

The question was then taken on the original motion, and carried as follows:

MAINE.

Yea.—I. Codding, E. Dole, Jr., C. L. Remond, 3
Nay.—Thomas T. Stone, 1.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Yea.—Silas Curtis, Benjamin Comings, 2.

VERMONT.

Yea.—J. W. Hale, J. Holcomb, B. F. Haskell, 3.
Nay.—R. T. Robinson, 1.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Yea.—Phineas Crandall, A. St. Clair, Dexter Dickinson, C. T. Torrey, G. A. Smith, A. A. Phelps, O. Scott, Geo. Allen, J. A. Canfield, Josiah Brackett, C. P. Grosvenor, N. Colver, N. B. Borden, 13.

Nay.—Elijah Bird, Wendell Phillips, Eliza Barney, Eliza Nicholson, Stillman Lathrop, N. H. Whiting, L. Boutelle, William Lewis, Joseph Southwick, Harris Cowdry, Anne Warren Weston, Thankful Southwick, Mary C. Frye, W. Bassett, M. R. Brown, Jacob Noyes, Rodney French, B. P. Bassett, W. P. Powell, Nathan Johnson, Israel Hayward, Benjamin Hall, P. R. Russell, W. Ashby, W. A. Burley, Thomas Cole, Mary A. W. Johnson, W. L. Garrison, Abner Sager, Oliver Johnson, H. C. Wright, George Bradburn, Abby Kelly, J. A. Collins, John S. Hall, J. T. Hilton, H. A. Farnsworth, W. R. Chapman, Francis Jackson, Ezekiel Hale, Jr., John Jones, G. W. F. Mellen, Sarah G. Buffum, T. P. Ryder, C. D. Davis, Amos Farnsworth, J. S. Hall, 47.

RHODE ISLAND.

Yea.—Hiram Brooks, W. Tanner, 2.

Nay.—Mary E. Chase, Abel Tanner, William Adams, William Buffum, Nancy L. Brayton, Thomas Davis, 6.

CONNECTICUT.

Yea.—A. G. Beman, A. C. Luca, E. D. Hudson, Sherman N. Booth, 4.
Nay.—Jonathan Leonard, George W. Benson, 2.

NEW YORK.

Yea.—R. P. G. Wright, E. W. Chester, A. Regna, Luther Lee, Anthony Lane,

James T. Hildreth, Robert Aikman, E. C. Pritchett, Hester Lane, Alvan Stewart, Alexander Crummell, James G. Birney, James Wallin, G. R. Parburt, Stephen Stanley, E. A. Lambert, William Patton, Jr., John Frost, Samuel Wells, Adrastus Doolittle, A. O. Wilcox, Roe Lockwood, W. S. Dorr, S. W. Benedict, Lyman W. Gilbert, James Canning Fuller, Henry H. Loomis, W. L. Chaplin, Beriah Green, Duncan Dunbar, J. T. Raymond, J. P. Turney, Hiram Barney, H. H. Kellogg, La Roy Sunderland, Theodore S. Wright, Henry H. Garnet, D. E. Jones, J. Buckner, John Cross, George Cragin, 41.

Nay.—Nathan Blount, R. P. Hunt, W. P. Green, Augustus Beach, Fordyce Rice, Edward P. Clark, Benjamin Fish, John Hopper, Abel B. Burke, Henry W. Davison, 10.

NEW JERSEY.

Yea.—Joshua Leavitt, S. W. Bussum, A. M. Torbet, S. A. Condit, A. Bradley, 5.

Nay.—Joseph Parrish, Jr., 1.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Yea.—Charles W. Gardiner, Henry Grew, Geo. M. Alsop, John G. Whittier, Samuel Webb, Joseph Healey, 6.

Nay.—W. Adair, Joshua L. Hallowell, Henry Peterson, Thomas S. Cavendar, Lewis C. Gunn, Mahlon Linton, C. C. Burleigh, Daniel Neall, Jr., Samuel Tyson, 9.

DELAWARE.

Yea.—Charles W. Denison, 1.

OHIO.

Yea.—Isaac Colby, John Rankin, 2.

ILLINOIS.

Yea.—G. W. Gale, 1.

MICHIGAN.

Yea.—Warren Isham, 1.

RECAPITULATION.

States.	Yea.	Nay.
Maine,	3	1
New Hampshire,	2	
Vermont,	3	1
Massachusetts,	13	47
Rhode Island,	2	6
Connecticut,	4	2
New York,	41	10
New Jersey,	5	1
Pennsylvania,	6	9
Delaware,	1	
Ohio,	2	
Illinois,	1	
Michigan,	1	
 Total	84	77

Mr. Birney presented a Protest, of 123 members of the meeting against the vote adopted by the Society respecting the admission of women to vote.

On motion, the Protest was ordered to be entered on the records and published with the proceedings of the meeting. The Protest is as follows:

PROTEST.

“We, the undersigned, members and delegates of the American Anti-Sla-

very Society, as a duty; and therefore a right, hereby protest against the principle, assumed by a majority of persons representing said Society at its present meeting, that women have the right of originating, debating, and voting on questions which come before said Society, and are eligible to its various offices: —and we protest against the assumption of said principle for the following, among other reasons, viz.:

“ 1. Because it is contrary to the expectation, design, and spirit of the Constitution of said Society, as clearly indicated by the proceedings of the framers of that instrument, at the commencement, in the progress, and at the completion of the work.

“ 2. Because it is at variance with the construction of said instrument, as made known by the constant usage of the Society from its first to its present meeting.

“ 3. Because it is repugnant to the wishes, the wisdom, and the moral sense of many of the early and present members of said Society, and devoted friends to the cause for which that Society was organized.

“ 4. Because, though assumed by a majority of persons representing said Society in its present meeting, we believe it to be wide from the expression of the general sense of the abolitionists of this country of either sex, and, if not objected to in this formal manner, might seem to have the unqualified and unlimited sanction of the friends of the slave and the asserters of his rights.

“ 5. Because it is rather the expression of local and sectarian feelings, of recent origin, than of those broad sentiments which existed among the friends of our great enterprise at its beginning, and which led to the framing of the Society on a foundation where all sects might stand and wield the potent weapon of our warfare against the oppression of our brethren.

“ 6. Because in conformity with these broad sentiments, and in opposition to local and party peculiarity, the American Society, at its first meeting, so far from contemplating the principle which is now for the first time assumed by the aforesaid majority, recommended the organization of distinct societies of the female sex.

“ 7. Because, how much and how conscientiously soever we might differ in respect to the abstract question of the rights of women and the propriety of their action in large deliberative bodies, yet waiving entirely an expression here of sentiment on this subject, we are persuaded that the principle which is, at this meeting, for the first time, assumed as aforesaid, is well fitted to bring *unnecessary* reproach and embarrassment to the cause of the enslaved, inasmuch as that principle is at variance with the general usage and sentiment of this and all other nations, under whatever form of government, and of every age: and while we thus speak, we also declare, that if the assumption of the aforesaid principle was, in our belief, demanded by the great law of right, and by a Divine constitution, necessary to rescue this nation from the great crime and curse of slavery, we would not hesitate to assume it in defiance of universal custom and sentiment, but would do so by openly and manfully changing either the Constitution of our Society, or our organization itself.

“ In offering this Protest, we refrain from expressing any opinion respecting the propriety of those, whose right to the contemplated membership was contested, voting on the question of said right, as was done in the present case, preferring to leave such proceeding to the obvious conclusion of common sense.”

NEW JERSEY.

Wm. R. Weeks, *Newark.*
Thomas P. Hunt, *do.*
And. M. Torbut, *Paterson.*

CONNECTICUT.

F. A. Perkins, *Norwich,*
Geo. Hall, *Norfield,*
H. G. Ludlow, *New Haven,*

C. P. Brush, *New Haven*,
 Amos G. Beman, *do*.
 A. C. Luce, *do*.
 James Quintard, *Norwalk*,
 Randolph Lindsley, *Meriden*,
 Julius Pratt, *do*.
 Lewis Beers, Jr. *Stratford*,
 W. L. Wilson, *Middletown*.

NEW YORK CITY.

G. Ratrie Parburt,
 A. Libolt,
 La Roy Sunderland,
 James G. Birney,
 Roe Leekwood,
 W. S. Dorr,
 Joshua Bishop,
 Patrick Reason,
 Chas. W. Denison,
 Hiram Barney,
 M. R. Berry,
 S. W. Benedict,
 John Jay,
 Thomas L. Jinnings,
 Robert Aikman, Jr.
 James Hildreth,
 Wm. W. Patton,
 Lyman W. Gilbert,
 Edward A. Lambert,
 N. E. Johnson,
 Albert O. Wilcox,
 Lewis Tappan,
 Thomas Downing,
 Duncan Dunbar,
 Hezekiah D. Sharp,
 Alfred Smith,
 Asa Parker,
 James Wallin,
 Darius E. Jones,
 Arthur C. Cox,
 Samuel D. Burchard,
 Henry H. Loomis,
 George D. Little,
 Augustus J. Gillett,
 Anthony Lane,
 Wm. D. Cooledge,
 Geo. H. Williams,
 T. McNamee,
 Edward Corning,
 Henry C. Bowen,
 Geo. M. Tracy,
 O. W. Norton,
 Edwin Wilcox,
 Robert R. Kellogg,
 Charles Kellogg,
 Samuel Leeds, Jr.
 George Storrs,
 Sumner Davidson,
 Elisha W. Chester,
 F. W. Graves.

NEW-YORK.

Abn. Requa, *Poughkeepsie*,
 Beriah Green, *Whitestoro*,
 Hiram H. Kellogg, *Clinton*,
 Amos Savage, *Utica*,
 Ed. C. Pritchett, *do*.
 E. W. True, *Pittsford*,
 Stephen Stanley, *Auburn*,
 L. C. Lockwood, *N. Windsor*,
 J. R. Willson, *Coldenham*,
 W. E. Whiting, *Brooklyn*,
 Nath. Colver, *Greenwich*,
 Fayette Shipherd, *Troy*,
 John Low, *Dutchess Co.*
 John W. Sleight, *do*.
 Robert Laird, *do*.

MASSACHUSETTS.

J. E. Fuller, *Boston*,
 A. A. Phelps, *do*.
 George Russell, *do*.
 Alanson St. Clair, *do*.
 Geo. Allen, *Shrewsbury*,
 D. W. Alvord, *Greenfield*,
 Joseph Hurlburt, *Curtisville*,
 O. Scott, *Lowell*,
 Samuel Osgood, *Springfield*,
 Phineas Crandall, *Fall River*,
 J. A. Canfield, *Andover*,
 T. E. Turner, *do*.
 James Birney, Jr. *do*.
 Sewall Harding, *Medway*,
 Daniel Wise, *Quincy*,
 Geo. H. Smith, *Salem*,
 Charles T. Torrey, *do*.
 D. Butler, *Dorchester*,
 Timothy Merritt, *Lynn*,
 George Goodyear, *Ashburnham*,
 Israel Trask, *Beverly*.

VERMONT.

E. D. Barber, *Middlebury*,
 J. W. Hale, *Brandon*.

MAINE.

Ebenezer Dole, *Hallowell*,
 Eben. Dole, Jr., *do*.
 Ichabod Coddington, *do*.
 C. C. Cone, *Brunswick*.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Jared Perkins, *Nashua*,
 Silas Curtis, *do*.
 W. H. Brewster, *Derry*.

MICHIGAN.

Warren Isham, *Detroit*.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Charles W. Gardiner, <i>Philadelphia</i> ,	Geo. W. Gale, <i>Galesburgh</i> .
Henry Grew, <i>do.</i>	
Samuel D. Hastings, <i>do.</i>	
George M. Alsop, <i>do.</i>	

ILLINOIS.

	Geo. W. Gale, <i>Galesburgh</i> .
	RHODE ISLAND.
	Hiram Brooks, <i>Providence</i> ,
	John Waugh, <i>do.</i>

Alvan Stewart moved the appointment of a committee of three to reply to the Protest.

G. W. Benson moved to lay it on the table. Carried.

Rodney French moved to adjourn *sine die*. Withdrawn.

C. L. Knapp moved to adjourn till four o'clock, P. M. Withdrawn.

J. C. Fuller was called to the chair.

The resolutions respecting Hiram Wilson, and the fugitives from slavery, were taken up, amended and passed.

“Whereas, the elevation of the free people of color is among the avowed objects of our organization: and, whereas the fact that thousands of our enslaved fellow-countrymen have been compelled to take refuge from republican oppression, in the Canadian possessions of the British Crown, does not release us from our obligation to labor for their intellectual and moral welfare: and whereas, it is our duty to aid them in obtaining the blessings of Christian education, in their only refuge from the power of the oppressor; and whereas, the efforts of our noble brother, Hiram Wilson, and his benevolent co-adjutors, for this end, ought to be sustained, and their sphere of labor extended till it embraces all these ‘poor outcasts.’ And whereas, it is unjust to those, and on other accounts unwise to throw upon brother Wilson the whole labour and responsibility of sustaining these schools, and collecting and disbursing the necessary funds; and whereas, there is no organized association which can legitimately take charge of these operations, except our own, and those affiliated with it; therefore

“Resolved, That we regard the object in which Hiram Wilson is engaged, viz., to promote the intellectual and moral elevation of the colored people in Canada, as having strong claims to the patronage of Christians and philanthropists.”

“Resolved, That it be recommended to the Committee of the Convention of Western New-York, holden at Penn Yan, to go forward in the adoption of the necessary measures to attain the end of their appointment.”

The resolutions respecting amendments of the Constitution were taken up, amended and passed.

“Resolved, That the same persons who were appointed at the last anniversary to consider and report at the next annual meeting, upon the expediency of amending the Constitution of this Society—namely,—Ellis Gray Loring, Amos A. Phelps, David L. Child, J. T. Norton, and William L. Chaplin, be re-appointed a committee for the above purpose, and that the subjects under their consideration the past year, be continued under reference to them.

“Resolved, That the chairman of said committee give notice as soon as may be, to the Executive Committee, of the results of their deliberations, that the members of this Society may be early informed through the Emancipator, of the amendments, if any, which may be submitted for their action, at the next annual meeting.”

The nomination of the Committee of Arrangements was adopted as follows:

“Committee of Arrangements for the National Convention.

William L. Chaplin, Utica, Chairman.

William Goodell, Utica,

Joshua Leavitt, New-York

H. B. Stanton, “

Gurdon Grant, Troy.

N. Saflord, - Albany.
 Hiram Fanning, "
 A. G. Alden, "
 Nathan Colburn, "

The resolution, first offered by Wendell Phillips, requiring the resolution on the annual report to be prefixed to the report as well as published among the proceedings, was taken up, and laid on the table.

The resolution, first offered by Mr. Birney, proposing a definitive settlement of the question respecting the State Societies, was taken up and laid on the table.

The resolution declaring the annual reports of the Executive Committee not to be the reports of the society, was taken up and laid on the table.

The report of the Committee on Publications was accepted and ordered to be printed with the proceedings.

REPORT.

"The Committee on Books, published by the American Anti-Slavery Society, have attended to their duty, and report—That the following Books and Pamphlets have been published or stereotyped since the 1st of the 5th Mo., 1838—

Emancipation in W. I. by Thome and Kimball,	12mo. stereotyped.
Anti-Slavery Manual,	18 "
Testimony of God vs. Slavery,	18 "
Bible vs. Slavery,	8vo.
Wesley's Thoughts,	48mo.
Emancipation in 1838,	8vo.
Elmore Correspondence,	4to.
Anti-Slavery Almanac,	12mo.
Slavery <i>As it is</i> ,	8vo.
Slave's Friend, No. 37, 38 and 39,	32mo.
Pro-Slavery Bible,	32 "
Prejudice against Color,	32 "
Northern Dealers in Slaves,	32 "
Slavery vs. Missions,	32 "
Nelson's Lectures,	32 "
Martyr Age,	8vo. not stereotyped
Smith's Letter to Clay,	8vo. "
Chattel Principle,	8vo. "
Morris' Speech,	12mo. "
* Sold at the Office, but not published by the American Anti-Slavery Society.	
Jay's Views,	12mo.
Guardian Genius,	12mo.
Address to the Churches,	8vo

"The above works, so far as the Committee have been able to examine them, appear to be in accordance with the principles and designs of the Society, and calculated to promote the interests of the cause which it advocates. While the Committee would make no invidious distinctions in respect to the publications, they would call special attention to one of a peculiar character, *Slavery as it is, or the testimony of a thousand witnessess*—a work exhibiting from incontrovertible testimony, the dreadful realities of slavery in practice—the physical condition of the slaves of the United States—and offering a mass of authentic facts relating to the secret and open abominations of the system, with arguments deduced therefrom, placing before the reader an accurate delineation of the grosser features of slavery. The Committee would suggest to this Society the expediency of taking measures to promote its circulation in all parts of the country.

JOHN G. WHITTLE, *Chairman.*

The resolution respecting the free colored people was adopted.

"Resolved. That the Committee be instructed to inquire into the expediency of more general and direct efforts to promote the political, intellectual and moral elevation of the whole of our free colored population, either by the agents and funds of this Society, or by a new association to be formed for the purpose—and in case the latter course is deemed most wise, that they be directed to take measures for the organization of such an association, either in connection with the National Anti-Slavery Convention in the summer, or at some other suitable period, as early as may be.

On motion of R. French, the meeting adjourned, *sine die*, at 4 o'clock, P. M.

JOSHUA LEAVITT, *Rec. Sec.*

[CORRECTION.—The name of Savilion Haley, New London, should be added to the list of delegates from Connecticut, on the roll, and to the yeas in the vote on the right of women to membership. The residence of William Bolles is New London, instead of Hartford. These corrections did not reach the printer in season to be made in the proper place.—J. L.]

TREASURER'S REPORT.

American Anti-Slavery Society in account with John Rankin, Treasurer.

[Cash paid out from May 1, 1838, to May 7, 1839.]

For Paper and Printing Emancipator,.....	\$4,991 31
" " " " Human Rights,.....	453 60
" " " " Slave's Friend,.....	25 05
" " " " Circulars, Petitions, and Prints,.....	21 80
" Books, Pamphlets and Tracts, published and purchased,.....	16,007 32
" Cartage, Fixtures, Rent, Postage, Envelope Paper, Advertisements, &c,.....	2,754 60
" Secretaries, Editor, Publishing Agent, Financial, Local and Traveling Agents Salaries and Expenses,.....	21,996 69
" Assistance in Publishing Agent and Secretaries Offices,.....	1,090 83
" Discount and Interest,.....	381 84
	<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0; border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 5px;"/>
	\$17,723 07

[Cash received from May 1, 1838, to May 7, 1839.]

CONTRIBUTIONS.

From Maine,.....	8468 57
" New Hampshire,.....	604 79
" Vermont,.....	1,284 08
" Massachusetts,.....	9,399 03
" Rhode Island,.....	23 60
" Connecticut,.....	2,361 27
" City of New-York.....	3,612 96 1/2
" Other parts of the State of New-York,.....	6,359 96 1/2
" New Jersey,.....	312 66
" Pennsylvania,.....	74 66
" Maryland,.....	10 00
" Ohio,.....	1,074 41
" Michigan,.....	40 00
" Indiana,.....	10 00
" Wisconsin Territory,.....	36 00
" Canadas,.....	120 36
" Haiti,.....	79 17
" Jamaica,.....	51 18
" England, (a Lady,).....	195 20
" Wm. Oaks, Esq.,.....	30 00
" Rev. Mr. Ward,.....	3 00
" Unknown,.....	3 00
	<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0; border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 5px;"/>
	\$27,000 99

PUBLICATIONS.

" Emancipator,.....	4,025 73
" Human Rights,.....	290 83
" Books and Pamphlets sold,.....	15,698 57
	<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0; border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 5px;"/>
Interest,.....	20,015 13
	5 71
	<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0; border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 5px;"/>
Paid more than received,.....	47,111 74
	611 33
	<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0; border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 5px;"/>
	\$47,723 07

JOHN RANKIN, *Treasurer.*
S. W. BENEDICT, *Asst. Treasurer.*

New-York, May 7, 1839.

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT.

In presenting their Sixth Annual Report, the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society congratulate the friends of free institutions that the doctrine of IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION is now established on a basis from which it cannot be dislodged, either by the malice of its enemies or the unfaithfulness of its friends. What a few years ago was wild, visionary and dangerous, is now mere sober sense and common honesty. While the human advocates of liberty have been arguing the safety of immediate disenthralment, (from the known principles of our common nature,) God, in his blessed providence, has worked out the problem by the liberation from bondage of 800,000 slaves. The present year has seen the keystone of this divine argument placed in its eternal home.

The organization of societies has extended itself during the year by the addition of 304, making the whole number 1650. It may be proper to remark that the organization of societies is not an exact index of the progress of our cause. In its earlier stages there were some strong motives presenting to such organization, which, if they now exist, have lost much of their force. Feeling that the general system of combined action is secure in its foothold, many who have adopted our principles doubtless retain their proper individuality as favorable to the spread of their views in their own immediate vicinity. In this, we think they greatly undervalue the importance of organized action. A more correct index is the patronage of the Anti-Slavery press, and the yielding of the ordinary newspaper press to become the channel of Anti-Slavery discussion. There now exist not less than 9 weekly, one semi-monthly, and 4 monthly papers, mainly, if not exclusively, devoted to abolition. With the exception of the monthlies, which are chiefly for gratuitous distribution, these papers have a circulation of not less than 25,000 copies, and are supported by subscriptions to the amount of more than \$40,000 per annum.

The report of the Treasurer shows the receipts during the year to be \$47,111 74, being more than the previous year by \$3017 67. According to a recommendation of the Society at its last annual meeting, the Executive Committee entered into arrangements with the State Societies of Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and New-York, by which the entire management of the cause in those respective States was surrendered to them, they guaranteeing certain sums to be paid in stated instalments to this Society for the promotion of its general objects. By virtue of this arrangement a considerably larger proportion of the contributions of abolitionists, than heretofore, has been expended by the state societies. Though this Committee, so far from complaining of such expenditure, wish it were increased a hundred fold, and though they would not find fault with the good faith and energy of their brethren of the State Societies in regard to their pledges, they are obliged to express their opinion that such arrangements are practically defective and detrimental to the cause at large. It is too much to expect of committees burdened with their own responsibilities, and to a great extent ignorant of ours, to take the necessary measures promptly to meet the instalments. More than that, to make up a fixed and stipulated donation, from an auxiliary to the parent society, abolitionists cannot be expected to give so liberally as when the national enterprise is presented in its full magnitude by agents who are familiar with the operations of this Committee. The Committee here refer to this subject as a cause which has tended to diminish the receipts of the present year, and consequently to curtail the operations of the national society. They believe that the national and state societies may all proceed as harmoniously and more efficiently without the restrictions of such arrangements.

The publications of the Society during the year have been as follows :

Emancipator, - - - - -	213,120	copies.
Human Rights, - - - - -	148,800	"
Circulars and Prints, - - - - -	38,440	"
Bound Volumes, - - - - -	19,958	"
Tracts, - - - - -	93,875	"
Pamphlets, - - - - -	210,639	"
<hr/>		
Total, - - - - -	724,862	"

From the first this Committee have felt the importance of revealing to the people of the free states the actual condition of the slave to whom they would extend liberty under law; not that the statute books of the South do not make an ample revelation to all who are well versed in the science of human nature, but they

wished to put in the power of the least philosophical to judge the tree by its fruits. Few are aware of the difficulty of this attempt. The slaveholders of the West Indies, in spite of the most revolting slave codes, succeeded for years in deceiving the people of England into the belief that the slaves were happier than their own peasantry. Our own slaveholders maintain a similar position in regard to the comparative happiness of their slaves and the free laborers of the North, and with nearly as great success. Multitudes of northern travelers are led in such a track through the South, that they come home with the opinion that if the slaves are not as happy as the northern laborers, they are as happy as their "inferior nature" will permit them to be. And on the other hand, those northerners who reside longer at the South are apt to disqualify themselves as witnesses by becoming implicated in the iniquity. The slaveholders indignantly spurn all discussion and inquiry, so that whoever should penetrate the South with the view of taking a thorough and impartial survey, would be in imminent danger of perishing on one of the gibbets announced by Mr. Preston in the Senate of the United States. The slaveholders refuse to rest their defence on the results of a fair investigation. In this state of things it becomes interesting to know what *they* have to say who have with great difficulty escaped from the happiness of the "peculiar institution." In the "Narrative of James Williams" the Committee presented to the public the professed experience of a slave of uncommon intelligence, and who had manifestly (his back bore its peculiar marks) "seen service" in the South. As the only test of its veracity within their reach, the Committee submitted the Narrative to the public substantially as they received it from the lips of the fugitive, taking care to elicit from him as many names and dates as possible, that whenever his story departed from the truth it might easily be refuted. It was promptly dispatched to all the persons and places mentioned in its pages. After a delay, for which it is difficult to account, the veracity of the witness was impeached, and testimony was submitted to the Committee going to show that he had in several instances falsified names and places in the course of his narrative. This testimony, though probably not such as would have satisfied a legal tribunal, so far affected the minds of the Committee that they discontinued the sale of the book. By a review of the whole as published in the Emancipator, it will be seen that it is not at all inconsistent with the supposition that the fugitive witnessed all the cruelties that he described, in the State of Alabama, and in his Narrative the precaution very commonly resorted to by such persons, of substituting false names for the

true. Begging that due credit may be given to the school* in which such a witness was educated, the Committee would congratulate the slaveholders that their impeachment has availed to procure his dismissal from the stand. We wish they could as easily set aside the other testimony which accompanied the Narrative, and the vastly greater array which *might* have accompanied it, proving, that however unworthy the witness, his testimony as a whole was true to the nature of slavery.

More fully awakened by this ease to the importance of making the public acquainted with the actual treatment of slaves, the committee have availed themselves on this subject of the services of one of their Editors, Mr. Theodore D. Weld, whose talent for thorough investigation, and former personal residence at the south, added to the fact that Mrs. Weld, and her sister now under their roof, are natives of South Carolina, and have occupied a high position in southern society, seemed eminently to qualify him for doing it justice. He has summed up the results of an examination of southern newspapers and periodicals, and an extensive correspondence with persons who have travelled or resided at the South and had an opportunity of observing in a great diversity of circumstances the natural ordinary treatment of slaves. Many of these persons who have so nobly responded to the call for light are extensively known; the characters of all are open to the community. The committee call upon the slaveholders to do, if they can, as they did in the case of James Williams, promising that so soon as they successfully impeach any witness, he shall forthwith retire. They also call upon those who by the narrative of Williams were awakened to sympathize with the

* Southern law brands the slaves as liars, whose testimony is to be received in no case where a *white* party is concerned; and we have the high authority of Chief Justice Henderson, of South Carolina, that it is *slavery* which makes them so. *See* the judge in delivering his opinion in a case where the testimony of a slave was offered:

"The master has an almost absolute control over the body and mind of the slave. The master's will is the slave's will. All his acts, all his sayings, are made with a view to propitiate his master. *His confessions are made, not from a love of truth, not from a sense of duty, not to speak falsehood, but to please his master;* and it is vain that his master tells him to speak the truth, and conceals from him how he wished the question answered. The slave will ascertain, or which is the same thing, think that he has ascertained the wishes of his master, and mould his answer accordingly. We therefore more often get the wishes of the master, or the slave's belief of his wishes, than truth. And this is so often the case, that the public justice of the country requires that they should be altogether excluded. Confessions made to propitiate the good opinion of the jailer, or to avert harsh treatment, are excluded on the same principle. I think the case of master and slave much stronger. The power of the jailer is temporary and limited; that of the master, permanent and almost unlimited."

slave, not to suspend that sympathy till the portrait as well as the painter is proved to be false.

It is with devout gratitude to God that the committee refer to the final triumph of truth and justice over slavery in the British Colonies. Divine Providence seems to have conducted the great cause of British emancipation with a view to furnish the strongest possible refutation of all the theories which conflict with the doctrine of immediate abolition. It has not only proved immediate liberation to be safe, but preparation to be both needless and impracticable. It has demonstrated that a government less popular than ours may be made to regard the voice of the people, and that the most inveterate slaveholding prejudices will yield to sufficient motives. It has showed that black laborers, so far from becoming a nuisance by being made free, are considered as highly valuable to the communities in which they reside, thus teaching us to dispense with all concern about their colonization. In fine, it has begun to set us an example of the white and black races living together in peace as well as in freedom, even where the latter greatly preponderate.

Though this report is not the place to enter into the details of this mighty subject, the committee cannot forbear to note some of the circumstances and results of a movement which bears so powerfully upon our cause. The movement for the overthrow of the apprenticeship was seriously commenced in Great Britain soon after the return of Mr. George Thompson; and to his zeal and eloquence, together with the noble and self-denying agency of Joseph Sturge, its success, under God, seems to be mainly owing. Ill did the friends of slavery calculate the consequences, when they essayed by brutal violence to drive George Thompson from our shores. But for his *agitation*, from city to city, throughout the United Kingdom, the apprentices might still have groaned under their old yoke with a new name, with little prospect that the 1st of August, 1840, would find strength enough left to shout the jubilee. The facts gathered by Sturge and his associates, the persuasive lips of Thompson, the unanimity and unconquerable energy of British abolitionists, waked up the nation. The popular assemblies on this question were without parallel for frequency, numbers and enlightened enthusiasm. Those held in Exeter Hall, in the city of London, and presided over by Lord Brougham, will stand as beacon lights in history. Firmly as the British government had been bound in the fetters of the slaveholding West India party, they were obliged to yield to this tide of humanity-directed public sentiment. It is one of those remarkable instances of human perverseness which God overrules for good, that they did not yield in the direction of an Act for the

immediate abolition of the apprenticeship. Against such a measure the ministry rallied to the utmost of their strength, and defeated it by a very small majority. *Their* measure was a bill to secure the carrying out of the apprenticeship on its original plan, and to protect the apprentices from the oppression of which the masters had been accused. It was sent to the Colonies, as the best that could be done for them by their special friends in the mother country ; and, strange to say, the colonial legislatures lost no time in convicting themselves of their enormous guilt by refusing to accept of it ! Leaving to the world the inference, that thus far they had altogether violated the engagement by virtue of which they received the £20,000,000, they proclaimed that they preferred to liberate their apprentices rather than stand by it for the future. They pronounced the apprenticeship, when administered in the spirit of the act which created it, an absurdity—wholly irreducible to practice. They confessed that the whip in the hands of an upright magistracy answered the purpose neither of coercion nor of wages. They confessed that they had not sought nor accepted the apprenticeship with a view to the preparation of the slaves for freedom, and that no such preparation was necessary. The combined wisdom of all the ministers in the world could not have devised a more effectual plan for showing up the folly and wickedness of that first-born and favourite child of gradualism. The measure, more than backed as it was by the public sentiment of Britain, had the effect of an immediate abolition of whatever remained of slavery—in short, rather unexpectedly to the British ministry it may be presumed, it effected all that had been asked by the abolitionists.

A reference to the debates in the Jamaica legislature will show in what spirit the colonists met the crisis in their affairs, brought about by an exposure of their conduct in the mother-country. It is the true key to unlock the mysteries of subsequent results. While some, in a noble spirit of penitence for the past and magnanimous honesty for the future, cordially voted to bestow upon the apprentices a boon which none dare deny that they deserved, others, and a more numerous portion, voted the same in the hope of continuing their oppression under a nominal freedom. They felt themselves worsted, and resolved for the rest to play a desperate game. Compelled to pay wages, they resolved from the first to recover their money in the shape of rent for the miserable houses and patches occupied by their labourers. And many are the instances in which they have endeavoured to extort more from their labourers in this way than the entire amount of their earnings. If emancipation, brought about by such motives and in such a spirit, should work uniformly and universally to the satisfaction

of all parties it would certainly be little short of a miracle. How ought it to work? Surely, not so as to secure labor for those who would still refuse to pay—not so as to make those the dupes of fraud, who had been the victims of force. When, therefore, we are assured that many estates in the West Indies are suffering for the want of labor, the explanation is furnished in the *feeling* so strongly developed in Jamaica. Said Sir Lionel Smith to a public assembly of planters in that Island, “ You are anxious to produce a panic to redeem the value of property; to create dismay, in order that you may speculate.” This was not denied. Such is the course of the venal managers and attorneys, who on account of the non-residence of proprietors possess a ruling influence in that and some other colonies. Again: it has been the policy of the planters to enhance the price of sugar in the mother country, and this they did by sending home the most unfavourable reports of the working of the negroes. In Jamaica the sugar estates are not a few that have been cultivated at a loss to the proprietors, because dishonest managers were unwilling to lose their commissions. Such estates must of course be thrown up or turned to some other cultivation than that of sugar. Here are causes quite sufficient to account for the refusal of the negroes to work, without resorting to the supposition that they are unwilling to work for fair wages. But in spite of all such causes, the great mass of the emancipated are at work, and the colonies are rapidly increasing in prosperity. Real estate is rising in value and crime of all kinds is on the decrease. Testimony to these points might be adduced far beyond the limits of this report, but the following will suffice.

The legislature of Jamaica was convened on the 30th of October. Sir Lionel Smith, the Governor, in his opening speech said to them,

“ The most important event in the annals of colonial history has taken place since I last had the pleasure of meeting the legislature of this Island; and I am happy in being able to declare that the conduct of the labouring population, who were then the objects of your liberal and enlightened policy, *entitles them to the highest praise, and amply proves how WELL THEY HAVE DESERVED the boon of freedom.*”

“ It was not to be expected that the total extinction of the apprenticeship law would be followed by an instantaneous return to active labor, but feeling as I do the deepest interest in the successful result of the great measure now in progress, I sincerely congratulate you and the country at large, on the improvement which is daily taking place in the resumption of industrious habits, and I TRUST THERE IS EVERY PROSPECT OF AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY.”

The House of Representatives chosen by and chiefly compo-

sed of the very planters who had been the cause of preventing the resumption of "industrious habits," in their reply, said,

"The House join your Excellency in bearing testimony to the PEACEABLE MANNER in which the labouring population have conducted themselves in a state of freedom."

"It certainly was not to be expected that so great a change in the condition of the people would be followed by an immediate return to active labor. The House, however, are willing to believe that some degree of improvement is taking place, and they sincerely join in the HOPE expressed by your Excellency, that the agricultural interests of the Island may ultimately prosper, by a resumption of industrious habits on the part of our peasantry in their new condition."

Such is the confession of the pro-slavery party at the moment when they were resolving not to do the business for which they were convened. If they could have told the mother-country that she had forced upon them a ruinous measure, would they not have done so? But the conduct of the emancipated was such, they dare not complain of abolition. Their sole grievance was that the Imperial Parliament had sent out a law for the regulation of persons, which infringed upon their charter, by authorizing a crown officer in certain cases to impose fines not exceeding twenty pounds sterling!

At the session of the legislature of Barbados, in the latter part of October, the Governor presented to that body a comparative view of complaints and punishments under the free system, from August 1st to October 15th, with those under the apprenticeship for the same time, in the previous year. It is to be remarked that the apprentices had the advantage of being protected by the special magistracy, while the freemen were left altogether to a local magistracy; yet under the apprenticeship for the two and a half months the punishments amounted to 3825, while under freedom they were diminished to 657, that is to say, there were not one-sixth as many. The table is subjoined:—

"BARBADOS.—Comparative Table, exhibiting the number of Complaints preferred against the Apprentice population of this Colony, in the months of August, September and to the 15th of October, 1838; together with the Complaints charged against Free Labourers of the same Colony, during the months of August, September and to the 15th of October, 1838. The former compiled from the Monthly Journals of the Special Justice of the Peace and the latter from the Returns of the Local Magistracy, transmitted to his Excellency the Governor.

"APPRENTICESHIP.	"FREEDOM.		
Total of complaints vs. Apprentices from the 1st to 31st of August, 1837,	Total of Complaints vs. Labourers from the 1st to the 31st August, 1838	582	
1708	Ditto from the 1st to 30th Sept.	386	
1464	Do. from the 1st to 15th October	103	
574			
Grand Total	3740	Total	1071

Total number of Apprentices punished from the 1st to 31st August,		Comparative surplus of Complaints in 1837	2675
Ditto from the 1st to 31st September,	1608	Grand Total	3746
Ditto from the 1st to 15th October,	1321	Total of Labourers punished from the 1st to the 31st August, 1838	334
Grand Total	561	Ditto from the 1st to 30th September	270
Total compromised, admonished and dismissed from 1st to 31st August,	3490	Ditto from the 1st to 15th October	53
Ditto from the 1st to 30th September,	105		—
Ditto from the 1st to 15th October,	113	Total Comparative surplus of punishment in 1837	657
Total	38		2833
Deficiency in compromised cases in 1837 comparatively with those of 1838.	256	Grand Total	3490
Grand Total	158	Total compromised, admonished and dismissed from the 1st to the 31st August	248
	414	Ditto from the 1st to the 30th September	116
		Ditto from the 1st to the 15th October	59
		Grand Total	414

“ NOTE.

“ It may be proper to remark that the accompanying General Abstract for August, September, and to the 15th October 1837, does not include complaints preferred and heard before the Local Magistrates during those months for such offences—viz : for misdemeanors, petty debts, assaults and petty thefts—as were not cognizable by the Special Justices ; so that estimating these offences—the number of which does not appear in the Abstract for 1837—at a similar number as that enumerated in the Abstract for 1838, the actual relative difference of punishments between the two and a half months in 1837 and those in 1838, would thus appear :

“ Surplus of Apprentices punished in 1837, as above 2833

“ Offences in August, September, and to the 15th October 1837 heard before the General Justices of the Peace, and estimated as follows :

Petty thefts	75
Assaults	143
Misdemeanors	98
Petty debts	19 ————— 335

Actual surplus of punishment in 1837, 3168

Says Mr. Hayes, a merchant of Barbados, whose credibility is vouched for by some of the most distinguished mercantile editors in this country, hostile to abolition :

“ I have now before me a Barbadoes newspaper, printed two weeks since, (viz. in December,) in which the fact is stated, that

in all the county prisons, among a population of 80,000, only *two* prisoners were confined for any cause whatever."

Said the Governor of Demerara, at the opening of the Court of Policy on the 17th of September, "It is a proud thing for the colonists—proprietors and employers—that nothing has occurred to indicate a want of good feeling in the great body of the labourers. It is creditable to them, satisfactory to their employers, and confounding to those who anticipated a different state of affairs." Again, "It is well known that the peasantry have not taken to a wandering life—they are not lost to the cultivated parts of the colony—* * * I hear of few commitments, except in this town, where of course, many of the idle have flocked from the country. On the east coast, there has been only one case brought before the High Sheriff's Court since the first of August. In the last circuit, not one! * * * With these facts before us, we may, I trust, anticipate the continual prosperity of the colony, &c." Such is the testimony of a man who has sufficiently proved his sympathies to be on the side of the planter.

But the fact that in all the colonies where there are uncultivated lands, great efforts are making to procure the immigration of free colored laborers—that there now exists a strife among the British colonies which shall get the most of these very laborers but yesterday freed, is perfectly conclusive proof that their labor is still profitable to their former masters. Monied institutions too, which never came into existence under slavery, are now taking root in the West Indies. Advertisements may be seen in their papers of Banks, Insurance Companies, Rail Roads, which are going into successful operation. Savings' Banks are also receiving the earnings of the laboring population—a very sure index of their fitness for freedom and ability to take care of themselves. Mr. Hayes, whom we have already quoted, thus testifies to the enhanced value of real estate.

"People do not buy land and houses, and rent properties for a long term of years, in countries where life is insecure, or where labor cannot be had, and the tendency of things is to ruin and decay. In short, men, in their senses, do not embark on board a sinking ship. Confidence is the very soul of prosperity; of the existence of confidence here, the immense operation in real estate, since the 1st of August, are abundant proof. There are multitudes of instances in which estates have sold for 20,000 dollars more than was asked for them six months ago, and yet at the time they were considered very high. A proprietor who was persuaded a few weeks since to part with his estate for a very large sum of money, went and bought it back again at an advance of 9,600 dollars. A great many long leases of property have been entered into. An estate called 'Edgecombe,' mentioned by Thome and Kimball, has been rented for twenty-one years at 7,500 dollars per annum. Another, called the 'Hope,' has been rented for ten years at 2,000 pounds sterling, equal to 9,600 dollars per annum. Another, after being rented at a high price, was re-lst by the lessee, who be-

came entirely absolved from the contract, and took 16,000 dollars for his bargain. If required, I could give you a host of similar cases, with the names of the parties. But it seems unnecessary. The mere impulse given to the value of property in this island by emancipation, is a thing as notorious here as the fact of emancipation."

Messrs. Scoble and Stuart, well known philanthropists, on a late tour of observation through the West Indies, under date of Nov. 29, 1838, mention the following among numerous similar facts.

"The value of land has continued to increase since the emancipation; that is since 1st of August last. Take the following examples:

Mr. E. L. Hinds is the proprietor of four estates. His slaves did not respect him. When freed, he desired his manager to hire them, offering low wages. They refused to hire without seeing himself. He would not see them. They waited a few days for him; then almost all left the estate. He was assured that their wants would soon compel them to return; but after waiting in vain about six weeks for them to do so, he found it best to rent his estates to a Mr. Ashby upon the following terms, viz.

For the 1st year	- - -	Currency £10,000	} Ten years being the whole term of lease.
For the 2d year	- - -	" 10,500	
For the remaining 8 years	" 11,000		

About three weeks after Mr. Ashby had gotten them, he rented them out to Mr. Rowland Taylor, who, besides taking upon himself, with full securities, Ashby's bargain, gave Ashby by way of premium, currency £1000 per annum; of which he paid down £2000, for the first two years, in advance; and gave securities for the payment of the remaining £8000 year by year, as the money should become due.

Mr. Samuel Inness, a merchant of this town, (Bridgetown, Barbados,) was so much terrified at the slaveholder bugbears of liberty, that he was on the point of giving up business and making his escape. A black merchant, Mr. Bourne, with difficulty dissuaded him. His business has since been considerably increased; and five weeks ago, he joined his brother, in purchasing Welsh-town estate for £36,000 currency. They sold it soon afterwards for £42,000; and Mr. St. John, who purchased it from them, has since been offered £3000 advance upon his bargain.

It may not be out of place here to inquire if there exists any cause which should present similar results in the United States, provided those of them which hold slaves shall see fit to declare property in human flesh illegal. In none of the British colonies did the whites bear so large a proportion to the slaves as in any of these States. In this respect we seem to have a manifest advantage. If white men can sustain law when they are only one to thirty, surely they can do so when their numbers at the lowest are nearly equal and in most cases nearly two to one. Is our climate less favourable to labor? Does our country present stronger temptations to vagrancy than the secluded mountain valleys of Jamaica, or the unexplored jungle back of Demerara, where nature pours out her fruits with unstinted and unceasing liberality. Is money less attractive with us than in a country where winter is unknown and two days labor will secure yams enough to sustain the indolent cultivator for a month? Or are our slaves in these

United States more ignorant and degraded than were those of the West Indies? The time is fresh in the memories of all who are old enough to read newspapers, when it was said in behalf of our republican slaveholders, that their slaves were far better treated and enjoyed many more privileges than those of the West Indies, and especially of the British colonies. In the West Indies they have had a few missionaries, whose chapels were but a little while ago burnt down and themselves persecuted—in one case to martyrdom.* In the United States all our large church organizations extend themselves over the whole south. That of the Episcopal Methodists, whose discipline disavows slavery, is said to embrace, as members, no less than 70,000 colored persons, chiefly slaves. It is claimed by all the advocates of slavery that provision for the slaves is universally made in places of worship at the south.† Will they now say that, notwithstanding all, the

* Mr. Smith, of Demarara, was thrown into a horrible dungeon where he died, in 1830.

† As to *religious* preparation let us compare Barbados with South Carolina. Our witnesses shall be Prof. Hovey, not a member of an Anti-Slavery Society, and Rev. R. W. Bailey, a northern clergyman, domiciliated in South Carolina. Prof. Hovey visited Barbados in 1837. Mr. Bailey's letters, as published in a volume, bring down his statistics to the same year.

BARBADOS.

According to Prof. Hovey, the island of Barbados, on an area of 166 square miles, has a population of 101,298, of whom 82,807 were slaves. Since 1825, it has been an Episcopal See; and the present bishop, the Rt. Rev. W. H. Coleridge, D. D., a man of great energy of character, is the zealous patron of schools of all classes, and has procured from England large sums for their support. The planters were much opposed to emancipation, and resisted it as long as they could without losing their share of the compensation. The bishop has now twenty-nine clergymen, and Mr. H. says the number of apprentices under their religious instruction, even now, "cannot exceed 6000." The Wesleyans have seven chapels, three ordained missionaries, and 1370 apprenticed laborers in their societies, and, "for the last ten years no obstacles have intentionally been thrown in the way of their labors." The Moravians have three establishments, and under their charge are 5200 apprentices. "From all these we have," says Prof. H., "an aggregate of a little more than 12,000, leaving about 70,000 without the means of religious knowledge."

SOUTH CAROLINA.

In this focus of continental slavery Mr. Bailey finds the following favorable state of facts, for which of course, we do not intend to vouch, remembering that the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia have testified that the slaves of those States are actually in the condition of *heathenism*. We infer that religious instruction has done what it could for them as *slaves* and failed, and with that we leave Mr. Bailey and the Synod to settle the question of fact. He says :

"The *Methodists* are perhaps better organized and more efficient in this service than either of the other denominations. They have *eight missionaries* entirely devoted to the black population, and their preachers are very successfully as well as actively devoted to this part of their charge throughout their

slaves on our "free soil" are more abject and heathenish than those of Jamaica and Demarara? But the advocates of our slave-

respective circuits. Their church embraces, in this state, 30,600 members, of whom about 20,000 are blacks.

"The *Episcopal Church* has 2500 members, of whom 600 are blacks.

"The *Baptist Church* has 36,000, of whom, according to the best estimate that can be made, about 20,000 are blacks.

"The *Presbyterian Church* has about 8000 members, of whom, in the entire absence of separate reports, I reckon 4000 blacks.

"The *Reformed Presbyterians* have 50 communicants—the *Associate Reformed*, 2155—the *Associate*, 140; making in the aggregate, 2345; of these, I suppose, at least 345 may be blacks.

"The *Lutheran Church* numbers nearly 2000 communicants, including several hundred blacks.

"A few other fragments of other denominations may add 1000 to the number of Protestant professing Christians in this state, making in the aggregate nearly 88,000 communicants in the whole population. Multiply this by 6, and you will have 528,000, very nearly the present population of the state.

"If you now subtract 51,000 from 315,000, the last census of the slave population, for the immense emigrations to the West during the last six years, you will have a *slave population* of 264,000, numerically *equal* to the whites, and with 45,000 black communicants you will have a *larger proportion of black* than of *white* communicants. 8 or 10,000 free blacks, I have not brought into this estimate, as there is among them but a single professor of religion within my personal knowledge; and I am assured also, there are very few in the knowledge of others.

"A comparison may be easily made between the religious condition of South Carolina and the city of New-York, so far as the gospel ministry is concerned. With a population, at the present time, but little short of 300,000, New-York has not 200 ministers of every class. With a population of 528,000, black and white, South Carolina has more than 500 ministers of all denominations.

"Every minister here is a preacher to the slaves. They enjoy the benefits of his ministry in common with the masters. When the Sabbath arrives to the master, it comes also to the slave. Wherever masters enjoy a gospel ministry, their slaves enjoy the ministry. Usually, and especially in the towns, they go to the same church, and listen to the same gospel.

"In attempting a comparison of the white population of Maine with the slaves of South Carolina, as they are represented in the Christian church, I will take for Maine a statement made not long since, Mr. Editor, in your paper, in which it was supposed the whole number of communicants was 60,000. I will state the present number of inhabitants at 420,000, which is probably within the truth, and thus give the proportion of church members in Maine as *one-twelfth* of the whole. The present number of slaves in South Carolina is supposed to be near 264,000—of these, 45,000, more than *one-sixth* of the whole, are reputable members of the Christian church."

Thus, according to the Rev. Mr. Bailey, South Carolina, in point of religious instruction, had the advantage of Barbados in the third year of its apprenticeship, inasmuch as its slaves enjoyed the preaching of the Gospel equally with the masters—that is, we suppose, generally, and more than *one-sixth* of them were actual church members, while in Barbados less than that proportion had heard preaching at all! Freedom works well in Barbados, in Maine and in New-York, yet religion has done more for South Carolina than for either of them! If the influence of the Gospel is adverse to slavery, is it not time it should operate in South Carolina?

ry have gone further. They have asserted that the slaves of the southern states are better off than the laboring men at the north. Says the Hon. J. K. Paulding, Secretary of the Navy, in a defence of slavery which was no doubt reckoned among his qualifications for the post which he now occupies:—"We believe them (the slaves) to be quite as happy as any race of hirelings in the world." What cause then can exist in the United States to mar the condition of freedom, which did not also exist in the West Indies? We believe none whatever can be stated; and we are the more confirmed in the belief by observing that the advocates of slavery still to profess to have "gloomy forebodings" that the West India "experiment" will *ultimately* prove a failure, and that when they assert a want of analogy between the West Indies and our country, they refer only to the *means* of bringing about the change. They do not attempt to prove that provided the States themselves should abolish, the same results might not be expected as in the West Indies. They throw themselves, in the face of present facts, upon prophecies of about the future; and attempt to evade the example of British freedom by denying the analogy between the power of the British Parliament and those of the American Congress.

That the example of the West Indies *does* affect the South, however, and *will do* so still more, is a point which becomes the clearer the more we look at it. If neither philanthropy, curiosity nor self-interest should send any of our slaveholders to the West Indies, the caprice of the winds would do it. Then they will see with their own eyes and become convinced. This conviction will grow among the intelligent of the South. The fall of slavery among the other European colonial possessions—now rendered little less than certain—will increase it. Southern minds will thus be buoyed up by truth against that great chain—that universal gag—which holds in its place the American slave system. They will feel its oppression. At length there will be an insurrection—a moral insurrection against the moral slavery, which oppresses the whites of the South as inexorably as the physical does the blacks. So fully accordant are such effects with the laws of mind, that we hear our opponents at the North exclaiming, How much good would be done by emancipation in the West Indies were it not for the immediate abolitionists, whose interference in the matter exasperates the slaveholders, and prevents them from listening to truth. It seems to be quite a general opinion among our opponents, that our continental slaveholders would follow the example of their insular brethren, if they could be let alone. In all this men deceive themselves by reasoning from an individual to a community. One man by contact with

another may be driven into a passion in which he shall resolve to listen to no argument, and possibly he may stick to his resolution till he dies—not probably, however, if he meets with the same argument in other mouths, and the conclusion is not only true but consonant with his interests. That *two* men should form such a resolution and stick to it, is still less probable ; and as you go on increasing the number of men, the probability diminishes. When you arrive at a community of millions it becomes, for all practical purposes, as good as an impossibility. The truth is, that in regard to the spread of opinions, a community of men is like an aggregation of magnets which adhere by *opposite* poles. The very fact that one man rejects an opinion is often the reason why his neighbor receives it. And if we are to trust experience, no opinion can be expected to triumph over general prejudice or interest, unless presented with such force as to awaken general hostility. Our attack upon slavery has aroused the Calhounns, the McDuffles, the Waddy Thompsons of the system, and the whole body of merciless flagellators who carry their beautiful theory into daily practise, but these are far from composing the whole body of southern freemen or even slaveholders. There is behind all these a quiet mass, who obey the laws of evidence and common sense, who have been blind for the want of light—motionless for the want of impulse—tyrants in the passive voice. On such minds the fierce fanaticism of John C. Calhoun, and the hypocrisy of Henry Clay, will produce reaction. That is the readiest, perhaps it is the only way, in which they could be moved. That is the way in which they certainly *are* moved. They are beginning to see that the abolitionists of the North are not like their northern opponents, laboring with a selfish end; that the object they propose, so far from threatening injury to the South would be the greatest possible blessing. Such a conviction may be temporarily suppressed by fear, but in that state it cannot die. The madder the tyranny of the system's champions, the stronger will it grow. The agitation at the North, and the West India light at the South, seem to be raised up by Providence to act in concert, and while either by itself might fail, both together must be irresistible.*

* Proof is constantly accumulating in the hands of the Committee to the fact that abolition is silently making progress at the South. Were the fervent letters of encouragement, received from the most respectable sources at the South, to be published with the *names* subscribed, it would indeed put this point beyond dispute, but it would be almost certain DEATH to the writers. Says one of these letters, which has been published without the name, dated in Tennessee, May 4, 1838 :

“ You are at liberty to publish, or use in any other manner, any thing in these

The Committee have labored to spread the results of the West India experiment before the whole nation, and they have reason

communications, which you may think calculated to interest the public mind on the momentous subject of slavery, with the exception of *names of persons and places*. I make this exception, not so much on account of the false calumnies and base vituperations of the wicked, inhuman and unfeeling slaveholding community, as on account of the probability that such a course, considering the disgraceful laws that have been enacted in this state for the protection of the slaveholder in the enjoyment of his *little idol*, slavery, might subject us unnecessarily to the reproach and abuse of an infuriated, *mobocratic* populace."

In the same letter the writer says, "Mr. ——, an elder in one of our churches, has gone to the General Assembly as a commissioner from —— Presbytery; formerly he was a student of this Seminary. I believe he is very nearly or quite a thorough abolitionist, and I think the safest plan for me to obtain a few abolition documents, would be for you to send me some by him."

Again, "The principle of universal liberty * * * is destined to triumph * * * contemplate its ardent struggles at the present day for the emancipation of the black population of our country from the bondage of an infernal system of oppression, and the conviction irresistibly forces itself upon us that the doctrine that *ALL men are free and equal* is destined ere long to become the foundation of all human governments—the main spring of all human actions."

It is through this all prevailing fear of Lynch law that many who sympathize with us, venture to write only anonymously, and a still greater number not at all. A letter addressed to the Hon. Wm. Slade, signed "a Marylander," and post-marked in Maryland, though supposed to have come from Kentucky or Tennessee, dated June 5, 1838, highly congratulates him on his advocacy of the slave. This letter so little needs the aid of a name to give weight to its thrilling matter, that we make no apology for inserting the greater part of it in this note.

"I write this letter for the purpose of stating the delight a perusal of your speech Dec. 1837, which Mr. Russell sent, has given me. No wonder the southern delegation should have been greatly excited; and that they should stifle all discussion by resolution. Slavery hides its head when brought to the test of truth, reason or justice. It is a system so rotten, so corrupting, so wrong and of such evil tendency, moral, social, and political, that it shrinks abashed from scrutiny, and seeks to cover its deformities under fair and specious pretexts. The American people have been long accursed and deluded by these flimsy excuses, and I rejoice that the time has come when men are both able and willing to sunder the links of prejudice by which we have been governed, and to dispel the moral and intellectual darkness in which we have been so long groping.

"I, sir, was born in the arms and nursed in the bosom of slavery; I have always lived in a slave-state and received my education in the midst of its influence. I know many masters and many slaves. My relatives are all masters. I sustain this relation also. Nevertheless, I declare, so far as I am capable of judging, the system of slavery throughout, to master and slave, parents and children, black and white, is full of evil—evil, deep, dark, damning—extending to every ramification of society. In the language of Mr. Clay of Ky., 'it is a curse to the master, a wrong, a grievous wrong to the slave—in the abstract it is all wrong, and no possible contingency can make it right.'

"The political evils of slavery are astonishingly great. The breath of slavery is political death. Its tendency is to make labor disgraceful by assigning it to

to believe with the happiest effect. In this work, however, they are sorry to say they have had little help from without the abolitionists.

slaves. Consequently the thrifty and industrious poor who work for an honest livelihood, who constitute the wealth of a nation in peace, and its bulwark in war; who introduce all the improvements into society in the arts, sciences, commerce, manufactures and agriculture are proscribed the company of a more wealthy neighbor, and are reduced almost to a level with the slaves in point of respectability. To a proud and noble mind nothing is more galling than such proscription, and the feelings in which it originates. Human nature revolts at such distinctions. The industrious and worthy seek a more congenial home, leaving only the very rich and very poor behind. Our lands and houses are vacated and impoverished, our activity, energy and enterprise transferred to cities or free states. The listlessness and apathy and indolence of the rich, and the hopelessness, destitution and wretchedness of the poor, is all that is left to slave countries.

"The moral evils of slavery is still greater. Every man must of necessity do violence to his conscience who exacts with the iron rod of despotism, the labor and proceeds of another's toil without compensation; who sustains and advocates a system, which has life without liberty, and families without marriage, which dissolves the closest and dearest of human ties, at the whim of a capricious master, which absolves a child from all parental obligations, and reduces man from the dignity and majesty of man, to a level with the brutes. Slavery, like the Java tree, lends its pestiferous breath to the winds of heaven, and carries ruin and desolation, moral and political, to master and slave in its train.

"I have lived long enough in a land of slavery to believe that its moral and social evils cannot be exaggerated. 'Truth is stranger than fiction.' It is difficult to believe what we know to be true, so great is the enormity and wickedness of the system. What think you, sir, of a man's having children by half a dozen of his slaves, despite the tears, entreaties and remonstrances of his wife; of his being so jealous of a son, in case of a negress, as to drive him from his paternal home; and of having children by his own mulatto daughters—and then to consign children and grand-children, by one fell stroke of the pen, to helpless, hopeless and endless bondage? Such an instance occurred in Maryland, and the perpetrator of so many crimes and outrages against the laws of God and man, and so many offences against the common decencies of life, was countenanced by the community.

"I trust you will not be deterred from the discharge of your duty by the denunciations of interested advocates, or the slanders and vilifications of a prostituted press, or the revilings and execrations of heartless dealers in human flesh. But unmoved, and immovable, persevere in your crusade against the wicked, Anti-Republican and unchristian system of slavery, until the negro shall burst his bonds asunder, and his heart palpitate with emotions of freedom, until freedom of speech, liberty of the press, and the right of petition, are fully established, and until the masters are emancipated from the bondage, moral and intellectual, in which they are now shrouded. The cause of freedom is the cause of Heaven. The poorest, most abject, most helpless, most wretched slave, is a man, and is entitled to the sympathies of his fellow-men. No power, no legislation, no usage, no antiquity, can give a man a right to do wrong.

"P. S. I trouble you for the purpose of apprising you that there are some even in slave states, who feel and acknowledge the evils of slavery; and I believe there would be many opposed to it, if they were to examine into the matter. Discussion and agitation will make all in favor of Anti-Slavery who are not swayed by prejudice or education."

tion ranks. But for the presses which, in the face of mobs and defamation, have dared to adopt the principle of immediate abolition, it may be safely asserted that the majority of our countrymen would have been left in ignorance of the fact that slavery in the West Indies had been abolished at all. Papers, denominated religious, and circulated as the special organs of large Christian sects, have contained columns of details concerning the coronation of Queen Victoria, but scarcely a word about the emancipation of 800,000 of her subjects. Does not this fact evince the necessity of an Anti-Slavery organization, extending throughout the whole community?

The Committee are happy to have received not only abundant proof from the West Indies, of the faithfulness of the accounts given by Messrs. Thome and Kimball, but certificates from distinguished men in our own country, that, in their opinion, these facts conclusively prove the safety of immediate emancipation. Their opinion is of course no additional confirmation to the minds of this Committee, but when such men as Gov. Kent of Maine, Gov. Ellsworth of Connecticut, and Gov. Everett of Massachusetts, yield their approbation to one of our publications, we may fairly warn our fellow-citizens not to reject it on the charge of fanaticism.

From year to year this Committee has had the pleasure to record the testimony of a great number of minor religious bodies, in all parts of the free states, and of various denominations, to the truth of our principles and their perfect accordance with the Gospel of Christ. Such testimonies have rapidly increased. During the past year they have been so numerous that it would be impossible to quote them, or even briefly to refer to them, without unreasonably protracting this report. The governing influences of the principal sects, however, still remain hostile to the principle of immediate justice on the soil. They still copy, to the full extent of its spirit, that policy which, in Congress, gags discussion and nullifies the right of petition. Not only do they turn a deaf ear to the cry of the two and a half millions who have "fallen among thieves," but they would seem to have resolved on expelling abolitionism from their pales by hurling the bolts of excommunication, as nearly as in a republic may be, after the manner of the great spiritual power of Europe. At any rate, symptoms have been manifested and feelers put out, as is well known to the public, which savor very strongly of such a mode of action. All such ecclesiastical proscription, however, the Committee can hardly refrain from rejoicing in, as the seal of Divine approbation upon their labors, when they remember that it results directly from an attempt to uphold, by ecclesiastical

smiles, a system which, according to the solemn confessions of these very churches, God cannot but abhor.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church furnishes a most signal proof that a religious body cannot embrace slavery without embracing death. In 1818 that body placed upon its minutes as the sentiment of the Presbyterian Church in America, the following propositions:—That slavery is “a gross violation of the most precious rights of human nature, and utterly inconsistent with the laws of God:”—That “the evils to which the slave is *always* exposed, often take place in their *very worst degree and form*; and when all of them do not take place, still the slave is deprived of his natural right degraded as a human being, and exposed to the danger of passing into the hands of a master who may inflict upon him all the hardships and injuries which inhumanity and avarice may suggest;”—that it is “manifestly the duty of all christians * * * to use their honest, earnest and universal endeavours, as speedily as possible to efface this blot on our holy religion, and to obtain the complete abolition of slavery throughout the *world*.” The same document also made the selling of a fellow church-member “contrary to his or her will or inclination,” a disciplinable offence, worthy, except in circumstances such as “can seldom happen,” of suspension from the church. Almost a score of years had rolled away, before any serious effort was made in the Presbyterian Church to carry out this Abolition Act and fulfil the *manifest duty* of all christians. The church had doubled and slavery had more than doubled in it. More than three-fourths of the southern church we are assured (by a slave-holding Presbyterian minister) had become fully implicated in this gross violation of human rights and divine laws. Then came humble and modest petitions, that the dead letter of 1818 might be revived and made living law. All sorts of parliamentary tricks were resorted to, to throw these petitions aside. They were at last referred to a committee to report on them at a succeeding Assembly. This committee, headed by a northern theological professor, reported to the Assembly of 1836, that slavery was a matter that did not come within the jurisdiction of the church, but was amenable only to the “laws” of certain States of the Union, and that to agitate it would distract the church. The southern members, in caucus assembled, told the General Assembly, that if they declared slavery to be an “immorality” they would not submit to such decision, but would withdraw. And the Assembly finally, resolved, in the face of their solemn declaration in 1818, that to act in relation to slavery would be “to make laws to bind the conscience in virtue of their own authority,” and, moreover, that they had not TIME to attend to the sub-

ject! So much for the peace of the Presbyterian church and the integrity of its General Assembly. The next time the latter assembled it was sundered into two jealous and hostile sects.

The fragments still continue, with a harmony which puts to shame their doctrinal discussion, to stifle conscience and outrage the laws of God, "for the peace of the church." In both the old and the new school assemblies the discussion of slavery has been most sedulously avoided; the great leaders on both sides thinking it far more important to establish their claim to be the legal Assembly, than to holy principles or a pure practice. It is refreshing to see that some of the northern Presbyterians, connected with these bodies, are beginning to see the sin of lending their influence to keep slavery through their means. One of them, we understand, the Presbytery of Chillicothe, Ohio, has withdrawn and established itself on a thorough Anti-Slavery basis.

The leading men of the Methodist Episcopal church have shown a similar disregard of moral obligation in maintaining what they choose also to call the peace of their church. The Rev. John Wesley, as the result of whose self-denying labors this sect was organized, and by whose name it is distinguished throughout most of the world, was a most zealous advocate of human rights, and lost no opportunity to bear his testimony against a system which he called "complicated villainy" and which he proclaimed inconsistent "with any degree of natural justice."

Messrs. Coke and Asbury who were sent over by Mr. Wesley to take charge of his societies in this country at the period of the revolution, at first zealously followed their leader in his hostility to slavery, but unhappily at length took the path of expediency on which their church has proceeded so rapidly downward. The following extract from Southey's life of Wesley illustrates their course.

"Wesley, had borne an early testimony against the system of negro slavery. Dr. Coke feeling like Mr. Wesley, took up the subject with his usual ardor, preached upon it with great vehemence, and prepared a petition to Congress for the emancipation of the negroes. With this petition he and Asbury went to General Washington at Mount Vernon, and solicited him to sign it. Washington received them courteously and hospitably; he declined signing the petition, that being inconsistent with the rank he held; but he assured them **THAT HE AGREED WITH THEM**, and that if the assembly should take the petition into consideration, he would signify his sentiments by a letter. They proceeded so far themselves that they required the members of the society to set their slaves free; and several persons were found who made this sacrifice from a sense of duty. One planter in Virginia emancipated twenty-two, who were, at that time, worth from thirty to forty pounds each. His name was *Kennon*, and deserves to be honorably recorded; but such instances were rare. And Dr. Coke, who had much of the national ardor in his character, proceeded in such an intolerant spirit of philanthropy, that he soon provoked a violent op-

position, and incurred no small degree of personal danger. One of his sermons upon this topic incensed some of his hearers so much that they withdrew, for the purpose of waylaying him; and a LADY negro-owner promised them fifty pounds if they would give "that little doctor" AN HUNDRED LASHES. But the better part of the congregation protected him, and THAT SAME SERMON PRODUCED THE EMANCIPATION OF TWENTY-FOUR SLAVES. In one county the slave-owners presented a bill against him, which was found by the grand jury, and no less than ninety persons set out in pursuit of him, but he was got beyond their reach. A more ferocious enemy followed him with an intention of shooting him: this the man himself confessed, when sometime afterwards he became a member of the Methodist society. On his second visit to America, Coke was convinced that he acted indiscreetly, *and he consented to let the question of emancipation rest, rather than stir up an opposition which so greatly impeded the progress of Methodism.*" Vol. II. 203, 204.

Four years before the present ecclesiastical organization of the Methodists in the United States, their Conference held the following language: "The Conference acknowledges that Slavery is contrary to the laws of God, man and nature, and hurtful to society, contrary to the dictates of conscience and true religion; and doing what we would not that others should do unto us; and they pass their disapprobation upon all our friends who keep slaves, and they advise their freedom." At the time the church was brought under its present organization, rules were adopted whereby each member was required within a specified time, when the laws would admit of it, to record an instrument making "every slave in his possession" free after five years, and every infant at its birth. And the following positive rules were enacted as the law of the church.

"No person, holding slaves, shall in future, be admitted into the Society, or to the Lord's Supper, till he previously comply with these rules, concerning slavery.

"Those who buy, sell or give them away, unless on purpose to free them, shall be expelled immediately." *Lee's His. Meth.* p. 101.

The next year after the church was organized it put forth the following sentiment in regard to the practice of slaveholding.

"We do hold in the deepest abhorrence the practice of slavery, and shall not cease to seek its destruction by all wise and prudent means." *Minutes for 1785.*

Some years after this, the book of discipline more particularly pointed out the means to be used for the "extirpation" of slavery. In addition to the great caution in the admission of members, "The Annual Conferences are directed to draw up addresses (petitions) for the gradual emancipation of the slaves; proper committees shall be appointed by the Annual Conferences, out of the most respectable of our friends, for the conducting of the business: and the presiding elders, deacons, and traveling

preachers, shall procure as many proper signatures as possible to the addresses, and give all the assistance in their power, in every respect, to aid the committees and to further this blessed undertaking. *Let this be continued from year to year, till the desired end be accomplished.*"

This was before the invention of the *cotton-gin* and while public opinion in *all the States* was looking for the gradual overthrow of slavery. But the fine gold of the Wesleyan Anti-Slavery Church has become dim, and its highest authorities have taken a stand against the very measures once required by their own discipline. In their last General Conference, 1836, they condemned "all abolition movements," and in their Pastoral Address exhorted ministers and members "wholly to refrain from the agitating subject." And in flat contradiction of their old standard, the Baltimore conference has justified the "PURCHASE or SALE" of slaves if unattended with "circumstances of cruelty, injustice or inhumanity :" The Georgia Conference has declared that slavery "*is not a moral evil* :" The South Carolina Conference, that it is "sanctioned," and "authorized" by the laws of God; and yet, strange to say, that it is *not a proper subject for church action*. We allude, now, to the resolution of the Conference in 1838, as follows :—

"Whereas, we hold that the subject of slavery in these United States is not one proper for the action of the church, but is exclusively appropriate to the civil authorities; therefore,

"Resolved, That this Conference will not intermeddle with it, further than to express our regret, that it has ever been introduced in any form, into any one of the judicatories of the church."

While the leading men of this Church at the North are obliged to confess that slavery, as it exists in these United States, is a "great moral evil," they are straining every nerve to put down all efforts that are made to abolish it, they are directing the censures of the Church against those of their brethren who proclaim it to be a sin, and making war upon abolitionism for the sake of securing peace with those who unblushingly declare that slavery "*is not a moral evil* ." One of the principal organs of their denomination, the Christian Advocate and Journal, distinctly refuses to publish any thing against slavery, or in favor of its abolition. Indeed so carefully has it refrained from giving intelligence from the West Indies, that long since the first of August, 1838, some of its constant readers have been found who were not aware that slavery had been abolished in the British colonies !

The last New-York Annual Conference called to account and actually suspended from the ministry, two of its members for attending an Abolition Convention at Utica, and enjoined upon the

members of the societies under its care, not to sustain that faithful and able advocate of the slave, "the Zion's Watchman." One or two other northern Conferences have humbly imitated their proceeding. Such are the doings of the Methodist bodies in which anti-abolitionists have the majority. But in some of the eastern Conferences they have not the majority. In the New-England Conference, where the abolitionists are a decided majority of the preachers, the champions of the slaveholder had to resort to humbler means than church censures to prop their sinking cause. It must here be remarked that the body was presided over by Bishop Hedding, an officer who has always assumed the prerogative of refusing to put to vote an abolition resolution when there was plainly a majority to carry it, and who, in a public and printed exposition of his views, declares that "the right to hold a slave is founded on this rule, 'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets.'" With the sanction of this man, Bishop Soule, the Rev. Dr. Bangs and others, whose theology has the same strange bearing upon human rights, there was brought forward "a plan of *pacification*," according to which peace was to be made between the abolitionists and their opponents, on the ground of mutual *concession*. An examination of the document containing the terms of this *peace*, will show it to have been an ecclesiastical *ruse de guerre* as disgraceful as it was subtle. The object of those who proposed it was to put down all special efforts to purify their *own church* from the sin of slavery, as appears even from the first sentence of "the plan," in the following words :

"Whereas the Methodist Episcopal Church in the North has been, and still is greatly excited on the subject of American Slavery, and the means which should be used for its removal from the church."

Insisting on the "vital importance" of peace, the document proceeds to say :

"We believe that the system of American Slavery is a *great moral evil*; and that the relations springing from this, which bind an innocent race to perpetual bondage to others against their wish, are *sinful*; *although we concede that the master who sustains this relation, is not, in every case, necessarily guilty.*"

If this concession to the abolitionists was not designed to be wholly taken back through its concession to slavery,—that is, if the rule was not intended to be swallowed up in the exception, we have presented to us the very singular spectacle of a set of "peace-makers" conceding slavery to be a "moral evil" for the sake of keeping peace with those, *in their own church*, who declare that "it is *not a moral evil*!"—and at the same time con-

ceding a *principle*, for the sake of procuring from their brethren a *practice* totally inconsistent with that principle! In the bosom of the Methodist Episcopal Church there have grown up of late a large number of Anti-Slavery societies, whose special object is to purify their own church from slavery, and in this way to promote its general overthrow. They owe their origin to the fact that while 70,000 members of that church are themselves slaves, and a multitude more are slaveholders, no expression of opinion, as to the moral character of slavery, has of late been allowed in a Conference capacity. These societies it was the aim of the "pacification" to destroy. The concession asked of the abolitionists was, that they would wholly abstain from them,—that they would in fact consent to be gagged as to any efficient pleading for the slave. The "peace-makers" did not propose to open the lips of the Conferences—or to labor in any assignable way to remove those weighty causes which had led to the formation of the Anti-Slavery societies. They graciously condescended not to regard it as an *offense*, "that prayer be offered in public for the master and his slave, or for the abolition of the system." But they recommended "that the Apostolic language be used, as far as may be, in such devotions"! Perhaps they thought such language might be less offensive, from the interpretations of pro-slavery commentators which it might carry with it. How much the concession of these "peace-makers," that "slavery is a great moral evil," is really worth, may be learned from the fact that they utterly refused to adopt among their "principles" the sentiment that "the principles of humanity and religion demand its extirpation at the earliest possible period consistent with the best good of the slave"!

The abolitionism of the New England Conference had well nigh gone to the bottom of this cunning pit-fall—covered as it was with green olive branches. By the goodness of God, however, they at last recovered their feet from the crumbling verge, and now stand firmer than before. Their societies and conventions have been more numerous, crowded, decisive than ever—witness the Convention at Lowell, the call for which was signed by 1500 names of men, all in good standing in the church.

We might make similar statements in relation to the other large denominations. Their leading men are insanely striving to keep *peace* with their slaveholding brethren of the South—and one of the terms dictated by the latter is, that their periodical press shall be dumb on the great question. In every case it is clear that they have departed from the principles avowed at the close of the revolution. No sect then dared to put itself in hostility to the cause of the slave's freedom, as we have abundant evidence

We here cite a single proof as a specimen of much that might be adduced, and of still more which might doubtless be obtained—by additional research. The Baptist Association of the Middle States, which met at Philadelphia, October 6, 1789, expressed its approbation of the Abolition Societies that had then been formed in various parts of the country, and recommended that similar societies be formed “in the numerous churches” which they represented, and this they did, as their minutes affirm, “Agreeably to a recommendation in the letter from the Church at BALTIMORE.” The extract from their minutes containing this recommendation, together with a letter to them from *Granville Sharp*, was communicated to the newspapers of the day with an introduction which we find printed in the “*New-York Journal and Weekly Register*,” of Dec. 10, 1789, *literatim*, as follows :

“TO THE SEVERAL PRINTERS OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA.”

“The following is respectfully offered as one among the many fresh proofs of the general conviction now prevailing of the impolicy, inhumanity and injustice of the SLAVE-TRADE, and also of that universal abhorrence wherein SLAVERY is now held by the religious of all denominations and in all civilized countries.”

Granville Sharp was well known as the uncompromising enemy of the whole system, the root as well as the branch—*slavery*, as well as the *slave-trade*. His philanthropic labors were cheered on by the Baptists of that day—even in the city of Baltimore—and a New-York daily paper thought proper to copy their eulogy and their Anti-Slavery minutes from the Philadelphia papers, as a matter of interesting intelligence. Such an article would now be as carefully shunned by their own most popular papers, as if it were infected with the plague!

We now appeal to our fellow-citizens, whether bodies that have so widely departed from their own solemnly acknowledged principles, and which are now anointing in the name of the Lord the most gigantic iniquity that ever cursed this fallen world, should not be driven from this unhallowed and unhallowing work, by the aroused moral sense of the community. Is any private citizen stepping out of his sphere, to rebuke such abominations? Is any man, not to say Christian, to blame for destroying a church’s *peace* with its own sins, by that church’s own standing rules of practice? Would these bodies but come back to the purity and honesty of their own avowed *principles*, their *peace*, for aught this Committee would do to disturb it, should be “like a river.” But standing where they do, and wielding their immense power to rivet the chains of two and a half millions, and to keep in countenance that vile prejudice of caste, which is both the effect and cause of slavery, while there is a free lip to tell the story of their

sin, they must expect to be like the troubled sea which cannot rest.

The Committee would here earnestly warn their fellow-laborers for the slave, to be on their guard against those lures to a deceitful peace, which will constantly be set up by the ecclesiastical friends of slavery. They will more and more endeavor to entrap us into compromises and pacifications, with a view to preserve to their southern brethren that great argument, "the religious bodies of the North do not condemn it." Silence gives consent. He who maintains a connection with a religious denomination which does not take the part of the oppressed, *and is silent*, consents to this stupendous iniquity, in a most important sense. Let us reserve our pity for those who are weltering by the way-side, rather than for those ambitious ecclesiastics whose bread or whose fame is jeopardized by every attempt to compare their practice with their professions. Their tears for the peace and honor of the church should long ago have been shed for their own inconsistency and hardness of heart.

The wide demand for Anti-Slavery publications, the altered tone of the press, the multitudinous expressions of minor bodies of all sects, the clouds of rejected petitions, the increasing host of Anti-Slavery societies, and above all the trepidation of our enemies, shows that a power is already accumulated that might do much, if properly *applied*. It is the strange mistake of even some of its professed friends, that it is no part of the business of the American Anti-Slavery Society to concern itself about the *application* of the power which it accumulates. In other words, it is supposed that the business of the society is accomplished where it has persuaded men to adopt its principles in regard to the sinfulness of slavery and prejudice, and that it should use no arguments to persuade them to put their principles in practice, by the best exertion of the only power which can absolutely reach the slave, to wit, *political power*. The committee are unable to assign a cause for this supposition, unless it be that in the earlier publications of the society little was said about the *application*, inasmuch as the *power itself* was yet to be developed. But in its Declaration of Sentiments and Constitution, the design of the society in regard to political action was very distinctly and unreservedly stated. The former document laid down the doctrine, as fundamental, that, "Every man has a right to his own body—to the products of his own labor—to the *protection of law*, and to the common advantages of society;"—"That the slaves ought instantly to be set free, and brought under the *protection of law*." If this be true, it would seem to follow that there is a *duty* on the part of "society" conciliative to the *right* on the part of the

slave. To whom does this duty attach? Not merely to those who make the laws or execute them; but to those who *make* the law-makers and the law-executioners—to every one who constitutionally possesses the elective franchise. The former are but the servants of the voters; if they fail to do their duty, the voters are morally bound to elect others who will not fail. And as, by the first rudiments of republicanism, the law-making power resides with the people, the duty finally comes home to every individual constitutional voter, of extending to the slaves "the protection of the law." To say that they ought to *have* such protection, is to say that *political action* ought to be had in their behalf;—it is to say that every individual who has a voice in making the laws, under which they live, or a sensible moral influence over those who have, is morally bound to exert such voice and influence to make those laws protect them. The truth of this doctrine of the Declaration—and it is a truth which many besides Abolitionists, so called, profess to admit—and the duty of exercising the elective franchise in behalf of the slave must, so far as we can see, stand or fall together. We can conceive of no pretense on which an American voter, who holds the truth of this doctrine, can escape the implied duty, unless it is that the guardian sword—the physical force of law is in wrong hands, and that the duty in question belongs to some monarch or autocrat, or somebody else who ought to assume the power which the *people* have unrighteously usurped. The proposition, as it is laid down in our Declaration of Sentiments, and as, we believe, it is generally understood, seems to us to imply, that it is the duty of *some government or other* to do for the slaves what every government professes to do for its subjects—throw between them and all aggression upon their inalienable rights, the shield of an adequate *physical force*;—for, if the "protection of law" does not mean that, it means nothing.* If, therefore, any of our citizens have been surprised or disappointed by our resort to the *ballot-box*, we think it evident, without going farther, that the fault is their own:—and if any Abolitionists who possess the elective franchise have refused to *use* it to the best of their knowledge in behalf of the slave, it appears to us that they have either renounced the belief that the slaves have a right to "the protection of law,"—thus either adopting the principles of slavery, or rejecting those of law—or, they would exchange our republican for some other form of government.

But the documents referred to, are still more explicit. Says the Declaration of Sentiments, "We also maintain that there

* By *law* here, we cannot suppose that any other than *human* law is intended, which cannot exist without *penalties*, and of which the penalties are necessarily *physical*.

are, at the present time, the highest obligations resting upon the people of the free states, to remove slavery by moral and political action, as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States." Again, "We will do *all* that in us lies, consistently with this Declaration of our principles, to overthrow the most execrable system of slavery that has ever been witnessed upon earth,—and to secure to the colored population of the United States all the *rights* and privileges which belong to them as men and as *Americans*." If obligations to act politically rest "upon the people of the free states," they rest upon each and every one according to his constitutional power. If abolitionists are pledged to the *whole* of political action, they are pledged to its *parts*. If "rights and privileges" do really "*belong*" to the colored population, not only as "*men*," but as "*Americans*," then it is the *duty* of white Americans, to exercise, in their behalf, their own American "*rights and privileges*." We quote from the Declaration of Sentiments, because it was drawn up with great care, by the Convention which formed the American Anti-Slavery Society, as an exposition of their views and designs therein, and because it has been subsequently recognized by the society itself as a standard publication.

The Constitution is not less to the point. Says its preamble—"Whereas we believe we owe it to the oppressed, to our fellow-citizens who hold slaves, to our whole country, to posterity, and to God, TO DO ALL THAT IS LAWFULLY IN OUR POWER to bring about the extinction of slavery," &c.—Those who would escape from the duty of going to the polls in behalf of the slave under this clause, must contend that constitutional *political action* is not "lawfully in our power," or that a lawful voter may not "*lawfully*" bestow his suffrage upon a candidate who would give the benefit of law to all! We do not deny that what is politically lawful *may* be morally unlawful, but we are sure that it could not have entered the minds of a majority of the framers of our Constitution that *voting* was so. Again, after conceding to the States the exclusive right of legislation within their own limits, the second article of the Constitution says, specifically:—"The Society will also endeavour, in a constitutional way, to influence Congress to put an end to the domestic slave trade, and to abolish slavery in all those portions of our common country which come under its control, especially in the District of Columbia,—and likewise to prevent the extension of it to any State that may be hereafter admitted into the Union." To think of carrying such a question in Congress, against the power that has governed that body and the country for half a century, without the aid of the *ballot-box*, were idler than to throw straws against the

hurricane. The power of influencing Congress by mere petition has already failed. Four times have the ears of the popular branch been hermetically sealed. In both houses are the petitions regularly delivered over unopened to the dust and cobwebs of oblivion. And in the mean time the petitioners are insulted by the respectful hearing given to the petitions of slaveholders, praying that no petitions relating to slavery but their own should be heard! So far as practical means are concerned, if the ballot-box be given up, the cause is given up with it. It is the only remaining means by which Congress can be influenced.

In noticing this very important subject, the Committee have thought it incumbent on them to give frankly their own interpretation of the instrument under which they act. For their opinion they claim no authority which does not equally belong to that of a member of the society. It is not to be concealed that a different interpretation is given by some—and among them are some whose names posterity will remember with gratitude as the pioneers of this glorious cause. By these brethren much solicitude is manifested, that abolition societies and conventions shall not assert that it is the positive duty of all those who possess the elective franchise, to exercise it at the polls in behalf of the slave; but that they should only condemn, as inconsistent with their professions, those who believe it their duty to vote, and yet do not vote in behalf of the slave. They complain of the attempt to pass resolutions, urging on all voters the *duty* of using their franchise, as an attempt to bind the consciences of abolitionists, inasmuch as some are *conscientiously* opposed to voting in any case whatever, and as departing from the original and broad platform of abolitionism. From what has been already said, it will be seen that the passage of such resolutions is not a departure from our constitution, in the view of this committee. Is it an infringement of the rights of conscience? It is readily conceded by us, we hope it will be denied by none, that every member of this society has, and from the nature of the case must have, a right to his own interpretation of the Constitution which he has signed, responsible only to a higher than earthly tribunal. But suppose a majority, agreeing in a certain interpretation, see fit to assert a certain consequent duty; the question is whether such assertion infringes the right of conscience of the minority. The minority may of course protest if they see fit. We submit whether the action of the majority is any more an attempt to bind conscience, than the resistance of the minority, whether credit for conscientiousness must not be given as well on the one side as on the other. On the one side, we claim that there may be a conscientious belief that our Constitution binds us to speak. On the other side

there can be nothing more than a conscientious belief that it permits us to be silent, while considerations not contained in it command us to be so. If for one or any number to express their views of what is demanded by our Constitution, be to attempt a tyranny over his brethren, we do not see why it may not be proved by the same reasoning, that all our Anti-Slavery operations are but an attempt to exercise a spiritual tyranny over the slaveholder, for he affirms that he feels in conscience bound to retain his slaves. By this remark we would by no means signify that what our brethren call their conscientious belief, but which we consider their error, is at all comparable to the enormity of the slaveholder, but merely our sense of the utter fallacy of their reasoning. Truth is ONE AND ALWAYS THE SAME, if men could but find her. Guilt and innocence depend upon motive and belief—but not so RIGHT and WRONG. When we proclaim to the slaveholder that his conduct is utterly, and in all circumstances *wrong*—a flagrant *sin*—we do not set ourselves in the place of his judge to gauge the depth of his *guilt*. That depends upon things which the Omniscient only can know. And if without faltering, or stopping to ask leave of circumstances or consequences, of this sect or that, we proclaim immediate emancipation to be the *duty* of the slaveholder, must we, with such an interpretation of our Constitution as we have expressed, stop to ask leave of this sect or that, before we can urge upon our own brethren and our own fellow-citizens the *duty* of using *all* their political power for the slave?—That our Constitution was designed as a platform on which all sects and parties might harmoniously unite in opposition to slavery, provided only they consider slavery a sin, it appears to us is but an assumption. We rather hold that it was established without any reference to the accommodation of existing sects. That members of so many clashing sects and parties should have met and for so long a time acted so harmoniously on this platform, is cause of thanksgiving to God. It has been a noble spectacle on which this Committee have refreshed their souls in times when there was little else refreshing. But glorious as it may be, the work of uniting all sects and parties, is not the special and appropriate work of this society. It is now obvious that the same harmony cannot continue and be co-extensive with our ranks, unless one party waives its right of acting, or the other its right of limiting action according to its own interpretation of the Constitution. However, it is a most desirable object, and so is efficiency. What course should be taken on this important question, the committee cheerfully leave the society to decide. For themselves the claims of two and a half millions, enslaved under the most intolerable system of

bondage the world ever saw, have pressed too heavily upon them to permit them to become very zealous partizans in any contentions foreign to the battle between liberty and despotism, or to admit such controversy into the columns of the periodicals under their control. At the same time they feel no disposition to prohibit any of their brethren from enjoying their own opinion or making use of all lawful and constitutional means of spreading it. Pains and penalties they apprehend do not enter into the nature of voluntary associations.

The question which has arisen, as fairly as we can state it, seems to be this, Whether the Society shall aim, through the powers of the existing government, to bring the slaves under the physical protection of law, or aim to bring the whole community into a state in which the physical protection of law will not be needed, or, so change its Constitution as to embrace both plans of action. To us, it hardly need be said, the two plans seem to have little in common. They diverge before they reach their object. That of bringing about nominal freedom by replacing human government with a sort of theocracy, rests upon principles which seem to condemn the other. Indeed, we do not see how those principles can allow their possessors to encourage political action in others, unless it be right to advise others to do evil that good may come, or to encourage every man to walk in the sight of his own eyes, whether his path be right or wrong. As to the comparative practicability of the two plans, reason in the light of experience and revealed truth must decide. To us, that which disavows political action, seems like leaving the work for which this Society was organized, as if it were not sufficiently difficult or its accomplishment sufficiently remote, for another which in the nature of man is impossible, and its accomplishment infinitely distant. Much as we regret that such a question should come before the Society with a prospect of creating dissension, we hope it will be met and settled once for all, and that those whose hearts bleed for their countrymen in chains, will, each party in its own way, henceforth have nothing to do but to arouse their fellow-citizens to the knowledge of their unspeakable wrongs, and test their respective plans by actual experiment.

We cannot, however, abstain from reviewing some of the occurrences of the past year, with the special view of showing the immense importance of a vigorous, unflinching, consistent and systematic use of the BALLOT-BOX, on the principle heretofore pointed out, of sacrificing, so long as shall be necessary, all mere party predilections to the cause of the slave. These occurrences will show, as had already been shown, in letters of

blood, that the great iniquity of slavery does not rest upon the people of the south alone—that it is a vast common stock of wrong, in which the north holds almost as many shares as the south. They will show that whoever will any where attack this system by argument must expect to be answered by lawless violence—and to find to his mortification that while the law is on his side, the executioners of law are on that of his foes. Indeed, so far has slavery corrupted the fountains of law at the north, and nullified the shield of our inalienable rights, that it is almost demonstrable that should abolitionists generally pursue the policy of abstaining from the use of their elective franchise, their very success would be their destruction. Their converts are from among the friends of law and order. Let these men be withdrawn from the polls, or let it be seen that when there their votes have nothing to do with their principles, and the elections, and consequently the legislation of the country will soon be left to the elements of the mob. Who can doubt that these men will then do universally by law, what they now attempt to do in spite of it? The imperative necessity of *political action*, in addition to what we deem its absolute necessity for the final abolition of slavery, consists in this, that having attempted the exertion of moral power for the deliverance of the enslaved, we find the whole country so rotten that the platform of equal rights and equal law is breaking down under our own feet.

Study the lesson which this year has taught us as to the protection of our rights from the violence of the mob. Philadelphia has had the reputation of being the citadel as well as of having been the cradle of American law and order. A number of her free citizens, finding no convenient place open for the discussion of subjects to them the most important and interesting, erected a spacious Hall, at an expense of \$10,000—a monument of their own patriotism as well as an ornament to their city—for enemies of their country and despisers of its laws, never expend their wealth in enriching and beautifying it.—This building, though specially designed for Anti-Slavery purposes, was dedicated to Free Discussion—and was to be rented for “any object not subversive of good morals.” Its founders yield to none of their fellow-citizens in purity of intentions and blamelessness of conduct. The following testimony to the liberality and nobleness of their views is quite conclusive. It is from the Rev. Thomas P. Hunt, the well known lecturer on Temperance, a southern man, and an advocate of the southern cause. “Permit me to express my gratification at the invitation I received, to deliver an address on Temperance in your Hall. As it was known to you that I was conscientiously opposed to the views of many of the managers of the

Hall on the subject of Abolition, and that I also never had any connection whatever with that society, the liberality which extends the invitation, with the assurance that the Hall should be opened to any benevolent or moral society, to the Colonization society, of which I am a friend and decided advocate, was as gratifying as it was unusual in these days of bitterness, and of exclusion." Thus we see those walls were not thrown up to afford a place where error, treason and fanaticism, might meet in secret and concoct plots for the overthrow of the country. All was open and public, and reason was left perfectly free to do her work upon error.

On Monday, the 14th of May, 1838, this noble edifice was dedicated to the noblest of purposes before an audience of 3,000 persons.—Discussions continued to be held in it from day to day, on the most important subjects, and the sentiments which were there uttered have been faithfully preserved and are before the public. All the circumstances of those eventful days have also been fully recorded, which renders it the less necessary to dwell on them here. Suffice it to say that placards were found posted about the city, on Tuesday evening, calling upon "all citizens who respect the rights of property" [in men,] to assemble in front of the Hall on Wednesday morning and "forcibly if they must," disperse the Anti-Slavery Convention. On the evening of Wednesday, an attack was actually made with missiles upon the windows. The Mayor was sought for to disperse the mob, but was absent from his office and could not be found till the work was over. The police force, we are informed by a Committee of the Common Council was "*extremely weak there,*" and was prudently advised by the City Solicitor not to make any *arrests* for fear of being overpowered. The windows were broken and the mob retired in safety. The Mayor was formally applied to on Thursday morning, the 17th, by the Managers, to protect the building with adequate force. He was told that the mob had already begun to assemble, but he did not stir to remove them. He took no measures to prepare an adequate force, but endeavoured to prevail on the Managers to close their Hall and discontinue their meetings, which he affirmed "*were the causes* of the past as well as the anticipated disturbances." He especially insisted that the evening meetings should be suspended, and would give them no assurance of protection from the police at that time of the day. All that he promised them was his personal presence and a *speech* to the mob in the *evening*, which he assured them was all that he could do. The mob having thus threatened the building with impunity during the day, the Mayor repaired to it about sunset, and met the Managers for consultation. Before entering the build-

ing, though accompanied only "by a few of his friends" he is said to have seized a man whom he found "haranguing the crowd," and "removed him from the scene of excitement," * thus proving what might have been done if an effort had been made. He told the President of the Board of Managers that if he could have possession of the building he would disperse the mob, but that otherwise he could not. The Managers, wishing to have a fair claim upon the country for indemnity in case the building should be destroyed, yielded to the Mayor the keys, who closed the building and requested them to disperse *their own friends* and to prevent them from approaching the building, by giving out that the Hall was closed. He then proceeded to the steps to deliver his promised speech to the mob. The speech was in substance as follows :

" *Fellow-Citizens* :—I wish to address you a few moments. I am sorry to perceive these disturbances, but I must hope that nothing will be transacted contrary to order and peace. Our city has long held the enviable position of a peaceful city—a city of order. It must not lose its position. I truly hope that no one will do any thing of a disorderly nature; any thing of the kind would be followed by regret ever after.

There will be no meeting here this evening. This house has been given up to me. The Managers had a right to hold their meetings; but as good citizens they have, at my request, suspended their meeting for this evening.

We never call out the military here. We do not need such measures: Indeed I would, fellow-citizens, look upon you as my police, and I trust you will abide by the laws and keep order. *I now bid you farewell for the night.*"

The crowd to which this was addressed, we are told by the Report of the Police Committee, "consisted of about three hundred persons, very young men, chiefly boys and striplings, and some respectable persons attended there by curiosity. No signs of violence were manifested by them; and at the close of his address, they applauded his views, gave him three cheers, clapped their hands, and expressed their acquiescence in his wishes."

" The Mayor then returned to his office, and the crowd for the most part followed him." But small, innocent and obedient as this little mob was, it seems to have been sufficiently large to bear to all quarters of the city the intelligence that the Mayor would not "call out the military" and that he had in fact taken leave of the mob for the night!

It hardly need be said that before many hours had elapsed, news was brought to this very obliging guardian of the peace, that the mob had re-assembled before the Hall and commenced breaking down the doors. He now, for the first time, summoned

* See the Police Committee's Report to the Council.

the Police force at his command, amounting to one hundred and sixty men. Arriving at the scene of action, he sprung his *watchman's rattle*, and caused his men to shout, "Support the Mayor." "The crowd opened and he passed with the police men through it, until he approached the building, where the work of destruction was making rapid progress. He then exclaimed to the crowd: Shame! is there nobody here to support the law? No answer was given; for the first time certainly since the foundation of our city, the voice of her Chief Magistrate called upon his fellow citizens for assistance in support of the law, without receiving a hearty and encouraging response. It was evident that those who were bent on evil were in force and resolute; and that the thousands who surrounded them looked on with deep interest, but with no desire to arrest the progress of destruction. The mob began to close upon the police, and to assail them. Several were knocked down, &c." We quote these most humiliating confessions from the same Police Committee's Report, got up by the friends of the Mayor to vindicate his reputation. Such was the whole amount of physical resistance which the Mayor thought proper to show to the mob which he had already insured against injuries of a military nature. Perceiving that his own peculiar police, to wit, his fellow-citizens to whom he had that evening delivered his speech, refused to aid his regular force, "the contest appeared to him too unequal" and he "did not deem it his duty to prolong it." That, having penetrated, or rather been admitted by the crowd to the doors of the building, with a force of one hundred and sixty men, he might have entered and extinguished the flames, is evident from the fact that two of his company *did* enter and under the following very singular circumstances. We quote from the same report.

"The only persons that succeeded in entering into the building were, Captain Hayes and Mr. Miller, of the police. They became separated from the Mayor in the crowd, and pushing for the entrance of the Hall, they penetrated with considerable difficulty through its dark passages. They found the doors at the head of the stairs locked; and being foiled in their attempt to proceed in that direction they went out of the building, turned up Haines' Street, and entered the Hall by the back door; they made their way to the room up stairs where the fires had already been kindled. Those who were in the building *were supposed to have retired by one of the staircases while Captain Hayes and Mr. Miller ascended the other*; but finding how few had gone up, they returned to the room, and addressing Captain Hayes by name, they advised him to withdraw. He refused to do so, and was putting out the fires when he was seized by one of them, who gave him a sudden jerk, and threw him down. Mr. Miller was served in the same way. There were in the room as he supposes from twelve to twenty persons—they were neither disguised nor disfigured, but Captain Hayes did not recognize among them any one that he knew, though he himself seemed to be known by them. The treatment of him indicated that while they did not wish to do him harm, they were resolved not to be interfered

with in the object they had undertaken. Captain Hayes and Mr. Miller, finding themselves unsupported by their friends and overpowered by numbers, reluctantly withdrew from the building."

Could proof have been more conclusive than this is, to the assertion that the Mayor might have extinguished the flames? The very champions of this assault, it seems, *retired* leaving their work half finished, at the approach of *two men*! They returned because they found *so few* had gone up. They now began to understand the drift of the "City Authorities" and proceeded with more confidence. To shew that they did not misunderstand their men, it is only necessary to remark, that while these twelve or twenty villains stood "undisguised" under the full glare of their own folly, a special assistant of the Mayor and an officer of police were present, and yet not one was *recognized*, nor even any precautions taken by which one could be recognized thereafter! Thus we have, without adding other proof of which there is the greatest abundance, a perfect demonstration, from the defence of his own friends, that the Mayor betrayed the peace of the city. In this treachery he was supported by those acting under him. The mob bore undisputed sway over the Mayor, the police and the fire companies, and the Pennsylvania Hall was laid in ashes. It proceeded with characteristic meanness to assail the people of color, but when it began to threaten other interests it was easily put down.

And in this case the treachery of the Civil Authorities was not confined to the mere crime of a physical omission of duty. It was a crime of principle. It was not the effect of cowardice but a predetermination to sacrifice law on the altar of Slavery and Prejudice. The Report of the Police Committee to which we have already so often referred, attempts not only to excuse the negligence of the Mayor, but *to palliate the atrocities of the mob*! After *professing* to deprecate and censure such a state of feeling, the Police Committee say, "they owe it to the cause of truth, to declare that this excitement, (heretofore unparalleled in our city,) was *occasioned* by the determination of the owners of the building and by their friends to persevere in openly promulgating and advocating in it *doctrines repulsive to the moral sense* of a large majority of our community." "It is no matter of *surprise* to them," the Committee are pleased to say, "that the mass of the community, without distinction of political or religious opinions, could *ill brook* the erection of an edifice in this city for the encouragement of practices believed by many to be subversive of the established orders of Society, and even viewed by some as repugnant to that separation and distinction which it has pleased the great Author of nature to establish among the various races of men." And

again—"our streets presented, for the first time since the days of William Penn, the unusual *union of black and white walking arm in arm in social intercourse*, it is a matter of no great surprise," &c. Here the *blame* is thrown upon the *Abolitionists* as the cause of the mob. They were guilty of the outrage of associating on terms of equality with people of color. The hypocrisy of this charge, as an able writer has well remarked, is shown by the fact that a majority of the people of Pennsylvania had just voted to exalt to the Vice Presidency of the United States, a man who has not only been seen walking "arm in arm" with a colored person, but actually married one of his own slaves and has sought and obtained *white* connexions for his mulatto daughters! Did the "moral sense" of the Pennsylvanians prompt them to mob that gentleman when he visited their chief city? It is only where slaveholders are displeased by it, and their tyranny is endangered, that northern men object to the intermingling of the races. It is only where the social intercourse of black and white takes place in obedience to the principle that MAN is MAN, that the "moral sense" of cotton-dealers is outraged. We submit that the reason assigned to justify the conduct of the mob, is more diabolical than their conduct itself. It could not possibly be brought forward in a community where the fountains of public opinion—the pulpit, the school, the forum and the press, were not deeply poisoned.*

Now with this beacon blazing before us, showing that slavery has undermined the very foundations of our own rights, and that so far from having the liberty to worship God according to the dictates of our consciences, we are forbidden even to treat with civility a fellow-man, do we propose to throw away our political rights, and give over into the keeping of such men as Mayor Swift, our consciences, our opinions; our wives and our children; our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor? The history of this Philadelphia mob is by no means singular. Similar effects have fol-

* As a sample of the utter and shameless degeneracy of the press, we subjoin the closing sentences of a letter to a London newspaper, in which J. W. Webb, one of our prominent commercial editors, attempted to justify, to the British public, the Philadelphia arson:—"I would frankly and in good faith declare, that lawless as may appear the destruction of a public building in order to prevent the dissemination of abolition principles, it was the work of men, every one of whom, are, both in principle and practice, opposed to slavery, but who made this sacrifice of their feelings on the altar of patriotism. Never did a free people give such a conclusive testimony of their devotion to the constitution and the institutions of their country, as when the respectable population of Philadelphia consented to appear regardless of the protection due to property, in order to nip *treason* in the bud, and demonstrate to their brethren of the South their determination to abide by the condition of our union. J.W.W."

lowed, and may follow, similar causes elsewhere. Those who believe that God has made the human race of one blood, and that he has made them to *dwell together* on the face of all the earth, have only to follow out their religion in their private hospitality, and they shall have the "moral sense" of their neighbors dashing in their windows and setting fire to their houses, and the civil authorities looking coolly on—sorry, but not "surprised,"—deprecating but not acting—censuring, but not suppressing the lawless disturbance of the peace. A thousandth part of this aggression upon rights, called our fathers to a war in which death was far more probable than victory: shall not their sons be roused to make an effort at the polls?

The case of the Rev. John B. Mahan, in connection with the recent barbarous legislation of Ohio, still more strikingly illustrates the necessity of political action. Mr. Mahan is a respectable citizen of Brown County, Ohio, and a Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was suspected by certain slaveholders of Kentucky, of having entertained at his house in Brown County, some of their fugitive slaves. He was indicted by the Grand Jury of Mason County, Kentucky, as having, "at that county," aided the escape of certain slaves, in violation of the laws of Kentucky—although he had not been within the county for nineteen years. On such indictment Gov. Clark of Kentucky, demanded him from Gov. Vance of Ohio, as a "fugitive from justice," and by a warrant from the latter he was arrested on the 19th of September, and thrown into the jail of Mason County. Gov. Vance seems to have taken no time or pains to inquire whether the *crime* with which Mr. Mahan was charged, came within the constitutional category of "treason, felony or other crime"; whether he had actually fled from justice, or whether he was likely to have a fair trial. Indeed, though like every other man arrived at years of discretion, he must have been aware that the crime charged was so neither in common law nor in common English, but only in the code of a "peculiar" institution not even named in the Constitution, and that the probability of justice was exceedingly small, he issued the warrant for his removal to Kentucky without a particle of hesitation. Scarcely had it been served, when he became convinced that the charge was false, and frightened at the political consequences of his reckless step, he dispatched a special messenger to the Governor of Kentucky to *re-demand* the alleged fugitive. The Ohio Political Journal and Register, the organ of Gov. Vance, thus speaks of the matter:

"It is now discovered, that he was not in Kentucky at the times stated in the indictments. It is plain, therefore, that the Grand Jury was imposed upon by

the oath of some perjured villain. It is equally evident that foul wrong has been done a citizen of Ohio—a respectable individual—a clergyman of the Methodist Church. This every good man will regret, and that the wrong shall be righted every freeman will insist.

When the Governor of Pennsylvania demanded of the Governor of Maryland the delivery of four persons who had violated the laws of Pennsylvania by actually kidnapping her native-born citizens, within her own limits, the latter took abundant time to consult, and did not issue his warrant till he had sent a deputation to the Governor of Pennsylvania to induce him, if possible, to *withdraw his demand*,—and then, before it could be executed, he laid the matter before the legislature of his state, who at once despatched a deputation to Harrisburgh to “*demand*” of the Pennsylvania legislature, “the dismissal of the indictments” pending against citizens of Maryland for “*alleged crimes, &c.*” and “such modification of their laws, &c.” But the Governor of free Ohio, when the *crime* was not against liberty but in its favor, did not put himself to the trouble of any such delay. He could not think of being so discourteous as not to put full faith in a slaveholding Grand Jury in the matter of punishing an abolitionist. But having discovered his error, and recollecting that he was a candidate for a second term in the gubernatorial chair, he wrote to Gov. Clark in the following loyal and beseeching style :

“ Since this arrest and delivery, there has been put in my possession evidence that cannot be doubted, going to show that there has been error in the case, and that said Mahan has not for many years, if ever, been in the State of Kentucky, and under our Constitution cannot be answerable to the penalties of her laws. The union of these states, and the peace and harmony of society require that the obligations to the Constitution and laws should be faithfully observed by its members, and whilst the chief Executive officer of this State, I trust I shall always be found to give force to these obligations by surrendering to the authorities of our sister States, those who may have violated the sanctity of their laws, and have taken refuge within our jurisdiction. Yet I cannot consent that a citizen of this State shall be taken to another State and tried for an offence that he (as it appears by the evidence before me) did not commit within her jurisdiction, and who, if the evidence be true, has not been within her territorial limits. Under these circumstances, I have deputed Gen. William Doherty of this State, to lay the evidence in my possession, before your Excellency with such explanations as may be required, feeling confident that you will give to this case that deliberate investigation that its importance demands, and that justice will be speedily awarded to this unfortunate individual.”

At the date of this letter, October 1, Gov. Vance had doubtless become fully aware that his election was seriously endangered ; and there is every reason to believe that his agent, Gen. Doherty, represented to the Whig Governor of Kentucky, the importance of having Mr. Mahan dealt with as tenderly as the peace and dignity of that commonwealth would admit. Gov. Clark, in a style

of condescension and concession, well calculated to win the affections of the loyal in Ohio, replied as follows :

“ The position assumed by you in relation to the fact of Mahan having never been within the limits of Kentucky, is clearly correct, and if upon the legal investigation of the case it be found true, he will doubtless be acquitted. I feel great solicitude that this citizen of your State, who has been arrested and brought to Kentucky upon my requisition, shall receive ample and full justice, and that, if upon a legal investigation he be found innocent of the crime alleged against him, he shall be released and set at liberty. I will, therefore, address a letter to the Judge and Commonwealth Attorney of the Mason circuit, communicating to them the substance of your letter, and the evidence you have transmitted to me. The anxiety manifested in your letter for the maintenance of the supremacy of the laws, and for the peaceful and harmonious intercourse of the States of Ohio and Kentucky, rest assured, sir, is fully appreciated and reciprocated by myself.”

This hint of the Executive of Kentucky to its judiciary is worthy of special notice, as well as the results which followed. Without it the fate of Mahan might have been widely different. The solicitude of Gov. Clark could not have been at all diminished when he heard that the Abolitionists of Ohio had defeated the election of Gov. Vance. Kentucky clearly perceived that to extend the jurisdiction of her courts over the State of Ohio, was going one step further than her most fawning partizans in that state could bear. Accordingly when, in the month of November, the Court of Mason County, by which Mr. Mahan was to be tried, was opened, the judge did not wait for the trial itself before proclaiming what would be held as law in the case. He took occasion in his charge to the *Grand Jury*, to renounce in the most positive terms, and on the most unquestionable authorities, all jurisdiction over the citizens of Ohio for acts done in their own state. In this most remarkable charge he first asserted the “sacred relationship” of slavery, attempted to prove, from the Bible, the duty of restoring fugitive slaves, denounced “the efforts of their pretended friends to educate them and emancipate them,” as rendering their condition “worse,” and “rivetting the fetters”—which bind them to their “happy” condition, and pronounced “all that *trattle* on the subject of *equality*” as contrary to the teachings of the Saviour and his apostles. Having thus proved himself a thorough and orthodox slaveholder, the judge proceeded to deprecate lynch law for the support of the system, and to show the injustice of extending the jurisdiction of the courts of one state over the citizens of another. “If you,” he most significantly told them, “without evidence that the *crime was committed here*, present persons in *another state*, who gave it aid, or countenance, by *speeches*, *writings*, *resolutions* or *caricatures*—you do yourselves great injustice, and produce a state of feeling adverse to our mutual peace

and safety, and to the sovereignty of States, not less than the personal security of citizens."

The trial proceeded, however, and after *six days* was brought to a close by the acquittal of the accused,—who was still held to answer for damages in a civil suit.

That in a case where an indictment had been confessedly procured by perjury, and the judge had so pointedly given his opinion in regard to the jurisdiction of the court, he should have permitted himself to listen to the speeches of four lawyers for the prosecution, [seeking to establish a constructive presence,] where no proof had been offered of an actual one, showed the deference that all courts in slave states are obliged to pay to lynch law, lest their business should be taken out of their hands. The public press of Ky. did not fail to magnify their own magnanimity, in thus letting go an innocent citizen of Ohio. They request the people of Ohio to observe "that there is no disposition on the part of Kentucky to interfere with their rights or encroach on the sovereignty of their state." But having dragged Mr. Mahan from his wife and children on a perjured indictment, thrown him into jail, and subjected him to enormous expenses in making his defence, have they done him the justice to indemnify him? Not at all. He must console himself that he has safely withdrawn his head from the jaws of the wolf.

Had it not been for the value of Abolition votes there is no reason to believe either that Gov. Vance would have interested himself to send a deputation to Gov. Clark to rectify his blunder, that the latter would have used his influence with the court, or that Mahan would have been acquitted. After Gov. Vance had lost his election, in his final message to the legislature, he boldly attempted to justify his conduct in the case, on the ground that the constitutional obligation to deliver up fugitives from justice, is imperative, and admits of no discretion or delay on the part of the executive on whom the demand is made. And yet in this very case he had to do with a state which as early as 1815 had passed an act, whereby if a Grand Jury of Ohio should indict a citizen of Kentucky, for removing from Ohio to Kentucky, any person as a slave without due proof—or in other words, for kidnapping a citizen of Ohio on her own soil—and should demand him of the Governor of Kentucky to be tried where the offence was committed, *he would not be delivered up.** The truth is that

* Mr. Walker, of counsel for the Commonwealth, in the case of Mahan, thus gives the law of Kentucky :

"The law of Congress of 1793 enacted that an indictment or affidavit properly authenticated should be sufficient to authorize the demand and delivery. The statute of Kentucky of 1815, further required that the delivery should not

the Constitution of the United States does by no means grant to Congress the power to decide *in what manner* the States shall discharge the obligations which it imposes on them, and in the absence of such grant, that power is constitutionally reserved to the States themselves. And consequently in the absence of any state legislation on the subject, it lay with the executive authority to fulfill the obligation of the state in a *manner* consistent with the grand end of all constitutions and all laws, the protection of the citizen against injustice and oppression.

But slavery is insatiable: If the monster ever slackens pace in her usurpations, it is only to take a longer stride over our prostrate rights. Kentucky gave up a jurisdiction which she could not conveniently exercise, that she might get possession of the whole govermental machinery of Ohio and use it at her will. She succeeded. So far as *law* may be perverted for the re-enslavement of fugitives, Ohio is to the full a slave State. That a majority could be found in the legislature of a State whose constitution rejects slavery, to welcome the visits of kidnappers, and for *their convenience* throw off every shred of protection for liberty, save what the unwritten will of "the brotherhood" guarantees to a certain complexion of skin, is a most shameful and alarming fact. It opens to our view, under the full sunshine of freedom and Christianity, a mass of meanness, prejudice and malignity unworthy even of the dark ages. Alas! language becomes poor and weak! Is there any thing in human shape so devoid of generous sympathy, so cold and icy-hearted, so cankered and shriveled with selfishness, that it can trample out that little spark of incipient manhood which prompts the crushed slave to seek the shelter of free laws, and yet can prate about liberty, and democracy and equal rights? Infinite littleness! Says the delegated wisdom of Ohio, in general assembly convened, with a magnanimity which occupies absolutely no space whatsoever, we have no wish to favor the escape of your slaves. Far from it. We have some 15 or 20,000 colored people of our own. Though they were

take place, till the person demanded was properly identified before a circuit judge to whom the warrant of apprehension issued to the sheriff, should be returned. The statute of Kentucky of 1820, still further modified the right of demand. It provides, that where runaway slaves shall have taken refuge in another State, 'and the owner or owners of such slave or slaves, *by themselves, their agent, or any other person with their approbation*, shall have removed such slaves from the State to which they had fled, and he, she, or they shall have been indicted for the same in that State,' that the duty of the circuit judge before whom the person demanded may be brought, shall be to inquire into the fact whether he is the owner, or agent of the owner, or one acting with the approbation of the owner; if such be found to be the case, *the circuit judge is directed to release him, and the Governor is bound to refuse the demand*."

counted to make up the 60,000 people to entitle us to a State Constitution, we refused them the right of suffrage in that instrument ; we have refused them their oath in our courts ; loaded them with all manner of disabilities ; shut our school house doors in their faces ; refused to give them acts of incorporation for their own schools ; have trampled on their petitions ; and in all manner of ways we have brow-beaten them and spit in their faces, in short, we hate them, and *we wonder so many of them are in our jails and penitentiaries.* Now, gentlemen of Kentucky, here they are. Far be it from us to interpose the shield of even a *white* jury between their rights and your claims. For decency's sake we wish, before you take them, you would swear they are yours before some magistrate ; that done, to his satisfaction, and you are welcome. As to your fugitives, cut with your own lashes and galled with your own chains, God forbid that we should give bread to wretches guilty of running away from that "sacred relationship," and "blessed ignorance," so eloquently described by your noble Judge Reid. No, no ; be it, and it is, hereby enacted, that whosoever shall pity one who has presumed to leave his master without his consent, to the amount of giving him a piece of money, or a piece of bread, or a mile's ride towards the north star, shall be indicted and punished as a felon.

Is there a *man* in Ohio who means to bring up his sons under the shadow of such foul and pestilent legislation ? Having made humanity a crime, is there not reason to believe that such a legislature will carry out its system by offering a bounty for all acts of meanness, treachery and cruelty. May we not expect it to give so much for murdering young birds, so much for tormenting domestic animals, so much for frightening little children, and handsome sums for hooting at and pelting aged and defenceless people in the streets. A complete system of such measures is evidently required for the safety of southern institutions, for till the hearts of the northern people are made like the nether millstone, it is in vain to expect that they will not nurse the sparks of liberty in the hearts of the poorest of the poor.

But it is time to look at the step by which such monstrous legislation has been brought about. That the treatment of Mr. Mahan was designed to pave the way we have already seen. After having entirely failed in convicting the person whom they had selected as their victim from among the Abolitionists of Ohio, the slaveholders of Kentucky resolved to carry their cause through the legislature. Gov. Clark, in his opening message, brought forward the whole budget of grievances and wrongs. Working himself into a phrenzy and boldly (considering the acquittal of Mahan and the fact that no other abolitionist had been even

arrested on suspicion) brought forward the following remarkable charge :

“ Some of the Abolitionists of an adjoining State, not contented with the mere promulgation of opinions and views calculated to excite a feeling of disaffection among our slave population, and to render this description of property insecure in the hands of its proprietors, have extended their operations so far as to mingle, personally, with our slaves, to enter into arrangements with them, and to afford them the means and facilities of escape from their owners. This flagitious conduct is not to be tolerated—it must be checked in its origin by the adoption of efficient and energetic measures, or it will, in all human probability lead to results greatly to be deprecated by every friend to law and good order.”

Then painting the “ spirit of abolition” in his own colors, he says :

“ This demon-like spirit that rages uncontrolled by law, or sense of moral right, must be overcome—it must be subdued : its action in this State should be prohibited under such penalties as will effectually curb its lawlessness and disarm its power.”

The means of subduing this spirit pointed out by the Governor are truly characteristic of slavery. “ The laws,” says he, “ should therefore be made adequate to this purpose, and this can only be effected in opposition to that feeling of fanaticism to which I have alluded, BY INFILCTING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT UPON EVERY INDIVIDUAL WHO IS INSTRUMENTAL IN AIDING OR ASSISTING A SLAVE FROM THIS TO ANY OTHER STATE.”

In pursuance of this and similar recommendations the legislature of Ky. despatched a delegation to the legislature of Ohio, charged to procure a law for the better security of Kentucky fugitive property. Strange to say the legislature of that state by a majority of both political parties, submitted with the most spaniel-like sycophancy, and the result was an act which tears from *every* citizen of Ohio, on the vital question of *liberty*, the trial by jury, and substitutes for it a summary process, before a single magistrate, without power on the part of the prisoner, to compel the attendance of witnesses, or to obtain the least delay except by paying down the costs in advance, and which makes any act of humanity, knowingly rendered to a fugitive slave, which may be construed into aidance of his escape, an indictable affair, to be punished by fine or imprisonment at the discretion of the court. In the House of Representatives this act passed by a vote of 54 to 13. It is true that acts similar to this, as to their objects, are to be found on the statute books of New-York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, to their deep disgrace. But they were not procured under a threat of “ capital punishment,” nor after a shameless attempt, by a perjured indictment, to get a white citizen of

either of those states within the grasp of slave-law ; neither do they preclude a resort to the TRIAL BY JURY. That of New-York expressly provides for one. That a law thus outraging the Constitution of Ohio, as well as the eternal obligations of justice and mercy, can be held valid by any conscientious citizen of Ohio, we will not for a moment believe. On the other hand, we believe it will kindle afresh the righteous zeal of abolitionists—we mean of all good men. No man will henceforth obtain their suffrages who does not proclaim his desire to efface this blot from the statute book. Their eyes will henceforth be open to the abomination of a system which seeks to fortify itself by such abominable means. They will no longer be deluded by the tales of servile happiness which Kentucky has so signally falsified. If such a law should practically prove any security to slave property, we might well despair of our cause ; but we trust in God it will prove quite the reverse.

The right of petition had already been trampled upon by a servile Congress. It was reserved, however, for the last session of the 25th Congress to consummate the outrage by employing a northern representative, Charles G. Atherton, of New Hampshire, to present the gag-resolutions. The deed was done in the name of Democracy ! The supporters of Martin Van Buren, who aims to hold the Presidential chair as a "northern man with southern principles," assembled in caucus early in the session, and the result was the concoction of the following resolutions, which were put in the hands of Mr. Atherton, to be presented and driven through by the previous question. Not a member of the other party even from the south, was permitted to be privy to their production.

RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED DEC. 11, 1838.

1. Resolved, That this Government is a Government of limited powers, and that, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has no jurisdiction whatever over the institution of Slavery in the several States of the Confederacy.

Passed. Yeas 198. Nays. Messrs. Adams, Evans, Everett, Potts, Russell, Slade 6.

2. Resolved, That the petitions for the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States, and against the removal of slaves from one State to another, are a part of the plan of operations set on foot to affect the institution of slavery in the several States, and thus indirectly to destroy that institution within their limits.

Passed. Yeas 134. Nays 67.

3. Resolved, That Congress has no right to do that indirectly which it cannot do directly ; and that the agitation of the subject of Slavery in the District of Columbia, or the Territories, as a means, and with a view of disturbing or overthrowing that institution in the several States, is against the true

spirit and meaning of the Constitution, an infringement of the rights of the States affected, and a breach of the public faith on which they entered into the Confederacy.

Passed. Yeas 170. Nays 39.

4. Resolved, That the Constitution rests on the broad principle of equality among the members of this Confederacy; and that Congress, in the exercise of its acknowledged powers, has no right to discriminate between the institutions of one portion of the States and another with a view of abolishing the one and promoting the other.

Passed. Yeas 182. Nays 26.

5. [Part 1.] Resolved, therefore, That all attempts on the part of Congress to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia or the Territories, or to prohibit the removal of Slaves from State to State, or to discriminate between the institutions of one portion of the country and another with the views aforesaid, are in violation of the Constitution, destructive of the fundamental principles on which the union of these States rests, and beyond the jurisdiction of Congress.—

Passed. Yeas 147. Nays 51.

[Part 2.] — and that every petition, memorial, resolution, proposition or paper touching or relating in any way, or to any extent whatever, to Slavery as aforesaid, or the Abolition thereof, shall on the presentation thereof, without any further action thereon, be laid on the table without being debated, printed, or referred.

Passed. Yeas 127. Nays 78.

The men who in their secret conclave shaped these resolutions, and were delighted with the idea of their having outwitted their opponents and secured their powers, were little aware, perhaps, that they were setting up a grave stone over the great "*republican experiment*." The civilized world now regards the experiment as a failure. The potentates of Europe have recovered from their fear and triumphantly point to these votes of the American Congress in 1838. The Peels and the Metternichs of Europe now proudly say to its few remaining republicans, look at your model republic and see its demagogues making a scaffolding of your sacred principles of liberty for the purpose of ascending to power, and then kicking them out from beneath their feet — a republic in which despotism after all is the only governing principle. There is not in the civilized world a republican who any longer dares to quote the United States as a successful exemplification of his theory. The representatives of the people, at the dictates of a handful of men who persevere in this age to wield over their species a worse than Turkish despotism, have committed a greater outrage against the inalienable rights of the

people than did the King whose yoke we threw off in 1776. We pronounce them traitors, who have stabbed and consigned to a dishonored grave the liberties of their country and the hopes of the world. For republicanism there is but one hope left, and that is of a RESURRECTION!

The first outrage upon virtue and common sense committed in these resolutions is the dignifying of Slavery, under the term, "INSTITUTION." This is a most monstrous and fraudulent perversion of language. The American Congress might with equal propriety have called counterfeiting, horse-stealing or shop-lifting an *institution*. Slavery is not an institution, but a crime at war with all institutions. The fact that legal enactments may be quoted in its favor, does not make it an institution—those very enactments are outrages upon law and order—nay more, they are outrages upon the foundation-principles of the Constitutions of these very States in which they are found. There is not a Constitution of any slave State which, when *taken as a whole*, does not condemn Slavery as a crime against *man* and against *government*—nay further, it is not possible for the ingenuity of man to devise a Constitution which shall be of any value whatsoever as a safeguard of rights, which does not do so; for in such an instrument, on the vital purity of inalienable rights any *exception* however small, *would destroy* the rule. The man who can allow himself to regard the *chattellizing* of his fellow *men* as an *institution*, one of the things that *law can establish*, has stepped off from the platform of republicanism; he has disqualified himself for being the legislator of a free people. If law *can*, without becoming *felo de se*, establish and cherish Slavery as an institution, then honesty and justice and humanity are *crimes*. In the name of God and man, we protest against honouring with the title of an "*institution*," a species of robbery by which, along with the priceless attributes of humanity, a part of our fellow-countrymen have lost what a distinguished Senator estimates in cash value at *twelve millions of dollars*.

We would fain believe that the first of these resolutions would not have passed by so large a majority, if any time had been allowed for deliberation. It is obvious that the Constitution of the United States does not expressly delegate to Congress the power "to legislate for the abolition of Slavery in the several States," nor does it prohibit that legislation to the States. Of course the power to exercise such legislation, except in case it should be "necessary and proper for carrying into execution" some of the powers which *are* expressly delegated to Congress, is "reserved to the States respectively or to the people." But the doctrine of this resolution that "by the Constitution of the United States,

Congress has no jurisdiction whatever over the institution of Slavery in the several States," is a very different thing. Scarcely a Session of Congress has passed since the first, in which it has not proceeded on a different assumption. Was Benjamin Franklin, one of the framers of the Constitution, mistaken when, in 1790, in drafting a petition to Congress from the Pennsylvanian Abolition Society of which he was President, he said, "Your memorialists have observed with real satisfaction, that many important and salutary powers are vested in you, 'for promoting the welfare and securing the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States,' and entreat 'that you will be pleased to countenance the restoration of liberty to those unhappy men, who alone in this land of freedom, are degraded into perpetual bondage, and who amidst the general joy of surrounding freemen, are groaning in servile subjection—that you *will devise means* for removing this inconsistency from the character of the American people—that you *will promote* mercy and justice towards this distressed race—and that you *will step to the very verge* of the power vested in you for the discouraging *every species* of traffic in the persons of our fellow men.'" At that time Congress had so far jurisdiction over the "institution" that it could impose a tax or a duty of ten dollars on "each person," brought into any State either by the internal or external slave traders. Since that, it has professed to abolish the external slave trade, and with precisely the same clear and unquestionable power it may abolish the internal. What truth is there in the assertion that Congress has no "jurisdiction whatever" over Slavery in the States, when it, and it alone, has express power over the outgoings and incomings of the system?—no "jurisdiction whatever" over Slavery in Virginia and Maryland, when by ten words it might annihilate the business of slave-breeding, the only business by which Slavery can possibly be supported in these States? There may be some technical sense of the word jurisdiction, by which the resolution may have a semblance of truth, but in the popular import of the language the resolution is false.

To the second resolution we confess. Though the objects of Abolition in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and of the internal slave trade, are great and noble, and each worthy of more effort than has been expended upon all, and though Congress has no right to refuse either of them from fear of any ulterior object, yet the petitioners would be the last to deny that they *have* an ulterior object—the destruction of the great PLUNDERING INSTITUTION throughout the United States—that institution which makes our country the *slave of slaves*. Could a no-

bler object be proposed, or a more unexceptionable mode of accomplishing it?

But says the republican, democratic gag, "Congress has no right to do that indirectly, which it cannot do directly." Then it must repeal the Acts, abolishing the foreign slave trade, and indeed every Act which has had or may have a tendency to enlighten the people and reverse the love of liberty. The Post Offices must be shut up. For the inevitable consequence of suffering a free diffusion of thought through such a channel will be the Abolition of Slavery. As a general principle, a shallower sophism could not have been committed to paper. On such a principle our powers of moral influence and persuasion were nearly useless, for their chief purpose is to accomplish indirectly what we have no right to accomplish directly. Evil may not be done directly or indirectly. But of the thousands of good deeds which we have no power to accomplish directly who shall forbid us to accomplish any one of them indirectly? Because we may not touch a neighbor's rum puncheons with our own hands and pour the poisonous contents in the streets, may we not influence him to do it—especially if we can do so by a similar operation upon our own? Benjamin Franklin, who was probably as able and as honest a statesman as either Mr. Atherton or Mr. Van Buren, was of opinion that Congress might, "countenance" "devise means for," and "promote," indirectly, the Abolition of Slavery, whether it could act by direct legislation or not. But it was deemed necessary that the gag should have some semblance of reason, and this was the best that could be had.

The men who have bravely betrayed the cause of humanity and freedom, as well as of the north, talk of Abolition in the District as a "*breach of the public faith*" to the slave States. If any point in the history of the Constitution has been demonstrated it is, that the general expectation at the time of its adoption was that Slavery would soon be abolished by the States themselves. It was on this understanding that the northern States entered into the Union. It is this understanding that the south has violated. The "*breach of the public faith*" is altogether on the side of Slavery. The north was assured by such men as Washington, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry, that Slavery at the south must soon be abolished—that causes were at work, or would soon be at the command of the Federal government, which would effect its entire eradication from our soil.* Moreover, at the time when the

* Judge Wilson, of Pennsylvania, one of the framers of the Constitution, and also a member of the Pennsylvania Convention to consider its adoption, said in the latter body:—

"This power given to Congress to prohibit the importation of Slaves, lays

Constitution was adopted, this so called "institution" was not peculiar to the south. New-York had nearly as many slaves as Georgia, New Jersey as many as Kentucky, Pennsylvania was then proceeding in a course of gradual abolition, on a slave population twice as large as that of Tennessee. Virginia, which then held nearly half the slaves of the country, had removed the obstacles to emancipation by her Act of 1782, and it was rapidly going forward. It was not till the genius of Whitney, in an evil hour for himself as well as for the cause of liberty, opened the south to the cultivation of Cotton, that Slavery began to recover from the shock given it by the revolutionary enthusiasm for freedom and equal rights. By the unexpected value given to slaves by the Cotton-gin, the southern States were stopped short in the work of emancipation. Avarice was aroused, and from that time has been the governing genius of this republic. Not only have the cotton-growing and slave-breeding States violated the tacit obligation which rested upon them to give liberty to their Slaves, but they have unscrupulously endeavored to strike down every constitutional right of their co-states, the exercise of which they have deemed hostile to their wicked practice. Not content to rule the republic through the spirit of trade and the machinery of party, they have overleaped the Constitution to extend their territorial limits and add new slave States to the Union. While they claim the right to exercise slaveholding power in free States, they trample on the rights of northern citizens visiting their own States. In almost every slave State a colored citizen of a free State is liable to an unconstitutional arrest. By a recent law in Alabama, he is made the *slave* of the first white man who chooses to appropriate him. They have violated the sanctity of the mails at their pleasure; and have endeavoured by Act of Congress to constitute the Postmasters, Censors of the press. They insist that no man shall be President of these United States who does not make the protection of their system of force and fraud the object of his paramount regard. They openly essay to control our elections; threatening to withdraw from their *party* if in its northern ranks the special friends of Slavery are not put up

the foundation for *banishing Slavery out of this country*; though the period is more distant than I wish. I little thought that the prohibition of the migration and importation of Slaves would be excepted to; and I am sorry that it could be extended no further; but so far as it operates, it presents us with the pleasing prospect, that the rights of mankind will be acknowledged and established throughout the Union. *Yet the lapse of a few years!* and CONGRESS WILL HAVE POWER TO EXTERMINATE SLAVERY FROM WITHIN OUR BORDER!"

For other proof of a similar nature, see the Anti-Slavery Examiner, No. 5, —the Power of Congress on Slavery, in the District of Columbia, p. 25

and its enemies put down—(witness, the mandates from the south in the opposite cases of Mr. Morris, of Ohio, and Mr. Atherton, of New Hampshire, in both of which the North according to her custom has servilely obeyed.) They encourage upon the floor of Congress a system of intimidation ; and Hon. southern members, when a venerable representative, once President of the United States, is insulted and threatened by letters postmarked and signed among their own constituents, so far from manifesting any shame or indignation, mutter between their teeth curses of approbation. Truly, it is with an excellent grace that the south puts in the lips of its adopted puppet a protest against “a breach of the public faith!” How long will the North suffer itself to be deluded with a pretence, which it knows to be as false as Slavery itself is mean and cruel?

“Congress” says the fourth resolution, “has no right to discriminate between the *institutions* of one portion of the States and another” &c. But granting *Slavery* to be an institution, the Constitution itself discriminates between that and its rival institution, *liberty*. “We the people” says its Preamble,—“in order to—secure the blessings of *liberty* to ourselves and our *posterity*, &c.” Here is a compliment of the highest kind paid to *liberty*, whereas Slavery is passed in silence—not a word nor a hint of its *blessings* in the whole instrument. Here is a plain discrimination with the view of *promoting* the one, and by a necessary consequence with a view of *abolishing* the other. Alas for the utter doltishness, not to say treachery of northern representatives, who could vote that Congress in the exercise of its acknowledged powers, has no right to discriminate between honesty and fraud, right and wrong, liberty and slavery, with a view to promote the one and abolish the other. So much comes of calling Slavery an *institution*!

The last resolution was divided in its passage, but we shall consider it as one. Those who voted *yea* on the first might as well have done so on the last clause. The first clause as flatly contradicts the Constitution, as the other recklessly violates the right of petition. The right of Congress to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia is so unequivocally delegated in the Constitution, that even Martin Van Buren, in the very bill of sale, by which he transferred himself to the south, dared not deny it. Henry Clay has not dared to deny it. It is a discovery of no greater antiquity than that of George McDuffie, that Slavery is the corner stone of our republic. Yet through the servile lips of the minion democrat, it now comes to us as the administration doctrine ! and is endorsed by a vote of 147 to 51. But, as if conscious of the rebuke they would meet among their constituents,

these contradicters of the Constitution have endeavored to provide a hole for escape in the phrase, "with the views aforesaid." But it will avail them little. Common sense is not yet entirely smothered with cotton-bags. It is understood and believed at the north, by men at the plough-tails and work-benches, that an act which is constitutional in itself does not become unconstitutional by being done for the public good, and least of all when, as in this case, it would be done for the good of all and the injury of none,—that is to say, with the "views aforesaid." Among the 147 who said *yea*, we cannot doubt that there were at least twenty men, who would not only not deny that Congress would have power to abolish Slavery in the District, if it existed nowhere else in the Union, but would vote for its abolition. Now, that abolition in the District *would* tend to promote Abolition in the States, we have the testimony of the whole south, for it is because they think so that they oppose it. Our twenty representatives, then, must answer to their constituents, why they would have Congress refuse to liberate its 7000 slaves, because their liberation would promote that of two and a half millions besides. Do such men wield their "acknowledged powers" for the public good? Are they fit to be entrusted with power?

These abolition attempts, says the resolution, are "destructive of the fundamental principles on which the union of these States rests." Of those principles on which it now rests, true enough, they may be destructive. But those on which it *at first* rested have long since been destroyed. That Union has perished along with the vitality of the Constitution, along with the freedom of debate and the right of petition, along with state sovereignty and the right of ingress and egress, along with the abhorrence of mob-law, along with the spirit that dared every where to call things by their right names. Of the Union which now exists and its "fundamental principles," the relation of *master* and *slave* is the exact type. The one is just as sacred and righteous as the other. The slaveholders are as anxious to maintain the one as the other—the life of the one being bound up in that of the other. And it is time that the representatives of the people should understand, that Abolitionists are as hostile to the one as the other. We are laboring for the resurrection of Union on the principles embodied in the Preamble of the Constitution of 1787, and of course to destroy Union on the principles of that Constitution which is engraven on the hearts of John C. Calhoun and Henry Clay—and written on the lips of President Van Buren and northern representatives, with a sort of ink which becomes visible when they approach the fire of southern oppression.

The entire reasoning of these resolutions betrays a stupidity

beyond that of the ostrich, to avoid its pursuers by thrusting its head in the sand. It proceeds upon the assumption not only that slavery is an *institution*, but that all things in relation to it are as they were fifty years ago; that the States all stand where they did when the Constitution was signed and adopted. Whereas, it has been the sober unprejudiced conviction of every thinking man for the last twenty-five years at least, that the equipoise of the Constitution has been utterly destroyed, and that, to perpetrate an outrage upon humanity which is in itself destructive. And while, by virtue of the very principles by which we are an independent and republican nation, we might approach the South with *bayonets*, and demand emancipation in the name of inalienable rights, we are treated as having committed a great outrage because we have come with *petitions*—and the nation is called upon to be horrified at our “plan of operations”! The Twenty-fifth Congress, like its predecessors, mistook the occasion which called forth this “plan of operations”; they were still more mistaken when they argued that because it was a “plan of operations,” it should therefore be gagged down. The *cause* which could set in motion such a “plan of operations,” no wise government would treat with contempt. To come before the legislature with half a million of names, of all sects and parties and from all parts of the country—and in the face of such opposition, betokens the elements of power.

If this brief exposure of the *gag* of 1838, does not do the office of a sermon in favor of *political action* at the polls, we must fail in recommending it. Act promptly and faithfully we must, or ourselves become slaves.

The history of the past year not only proclaims the necessity of political action, but of the utmost vigilance and wariness in its exercise. We have to meet and provide against the long practised and unprincipled cunning of partisan leaders, as anxious to secure our votes as they are those of the slaveholders. They stick at no frauds. They abide by no pledges. They are ever ready to palm upon us, as Abolitionists, men who would abolish slavery only in the abstract, and somewhere about the middle of the future. They preach to us as a sound principle, “Choose the least of two evils,” and then endeavor to show that of the party candidates their’s should have the benefit of the rule. But it is important that all who mean to hold their vote sacred to liberty, should understand that the principle is utterly fallacious. A **GOOD CANDIDATE OR NONE**, is the only rule that can benefit the slave. If both candidates are *evils*, it were better to submit to a temporary evil, if by that means you may secure a permanent good.

These maxims were most strikingly illustrated in the last gubernatorial election in the state of New-York. The candidates for Governor and Lt. Governor were not put in nomination till a short period before the election. They were then questioned by a Committee of the State Anti-Slavery Society, on all those subjects pertaining to slavery, which might come under their official cognizance if elected. Of the Whig candidates, Mr. Bradish, for Lieutenant Governor, answered fully and favorably on every point; Mr. Seward, for Governor, was on all points the reverse, though with much effort to make it appear that he was at heart the friend of freedom. The Administration candidates both answered fully and promptly in the negative. In the case of Mr. Bradish the duty of Abolitionists was plain, but in that of Mr. Seward there arose a doubt. Many supposed him more favorable to the cause of freedom than his opponent, and therefore gave him their votes. Most, it is presumed, thought there was so little to choose between the candidates for Governor that they followed their own party preferences. That this was a great mistake, we believe a large portion of them are now sensible. As the anti-abolitionists in large numbers, especially in the city of New-York, left off the name of Bradish from their tickets, his gain from the abolitionists scarcely appeared. Had the Abolitionists all scattered their votes for Governor, they would have been sure of making their strength apparent. There would have been no danger after that, of either party putting forward a candidate unwilling to go the length of abolishing what remains of slavery in the State of New-York.

The subserviency to slavery of the present party organizations has been most signally illustrated in Ohio. The numerous Abolitionists of that State very justly desired the re-election of the Hon. Thos. Morris, the only man who has dared, with the spirit of a man and a Christian, to uphold free institutions and condemn slavery in the Senate of the United States. To this end most of them, it is said, and we see no reason to doubt the assertion, voted for "democratic" candidates to the State legislature, men who they believed would elect Mr. Morris. But the fiat came forth from the South that Mr. Morris should be dropped, and the "democratic" legislature of Ohio obeyed! Their selection of a candidate to replace the bold and noble-hearted champion of the people's rights, showed, however, their disposition to retain power by gratifying the Abolitionists so far as they could consistently with the mandates of the slaveholder. They elected Benjamin Tappan, a man who has long enjoyed the reputation in that State of being an Abolitionist, but who, to secure his election, is said to have given a pledge not to agitate the delicate question in his place in the Senate! In this instance the fault was, in trusting

to the party caucus candidates, instead of securing the election to the legislature of men who would have re-elected Mr. Morris irrespective of party.

It is due to the Abolitionists of Ohio, however, to say that they manifested much wisdom as well as regard for principle by defeating the re-election of Mr. Vance to the office of Governor. A man who had hastily and recklessly delivered up an Abolitionist to the mercy of Kentucky justice, was evidently unfit for the executive chair of a free State. His defeat taught his party, and the country at large, a lesson more intelligible to political men than any other. We hope the opposite party will be taught a similar one, in the persons of those representatives who have voted for the Servile Bill. The strength of abolitionism at the polls may be despised at first, but it is ever *increasing*. Let it be unceasingly applied, and with evident impartiality, and it will soon become too formidable to be trifled with.

The election of members of Congress, has shown a number of triumphs of abolitionism, which ought to encourage to further effort. Among them we may mention the increased vote of Mr. Slade of Vermont, the election of Mr. Giddings in place of Mr. Whittlesey in Ohio, the election of Mr. Gates in New-York, and that of Mr. Alvord in Massachusetts. The latter is well known as the author of the able reports in the legislature of Massachusetts, on the right of trial by jury in the case of fugitive slaves, on the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and on the annexation of Texas.

It is undoubtedly through the political action of the Abolitionists that the annexation of Texas has been thus far prevented. Though we do not flatter ourselves that the design has been relinquished, either on the part of the South or of that pseudo-republic, it has obviously been foiled in the first attempt. The policy which the conspirators are now obliged to adopt is to allure to Texas as many citizens of the United States as possible, allowing them to become citizens of that republic without giving up their allegiance to ours. In this way they hope to establish so intimate a connection between themselves and all parts of our country, as to neutralize the opposition to a union. The troubles of Mexico are highly favorable to their scheme. We may expect, at no distant day, a new application for admission, brought upon a servile Congress after the manner of the Atherton resolutions. For such an event it behoves the friends of humanity to be prepared.

It is also matter of encouragement that the recognition of Haitian independence is beginning to be considered an object worthy of national regard. But for the slaveholders, it is believed our

relations with that interesting republic would long ago have been put on the same footing as with other nations. It is one of the most surprising proofs of northern subserviency, that our merchants should so long have consented to sacrifice, for the comfort of slaveholders, what too many of them consider their *dearest interests*, the profits of trade. Haiti, in its fertility and the richness and variety of its natural productions, has justly been called the queen of the Antilles. For the last thirty years the hostility and mean jealousy of the world, self-styled *civilized*, have done all they could to crush her commerce and annihilate her national resources. Her government, ever threatened by the French, has been obliged to keep a large and burdensome military establishment, and her maritime cities have had to exist as they could, under a Constitution one of whose provisions was, that, in case of an invasion, *they should disappear and their people betake themselves to the mountains*. Yet under all these discouragements, our commerce with Haiti has amounted to the average value of two millions per annum.*

Almost immediately after the passage of Atherton's resolutions, petitions were presented to Congress, praying for the recognition of Haiti and after considerable debate, were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Strenuous efforts were made by the ultra slaveholders to prevent their *reception*, and although from the *type* and phraseology of the petitions, as well as the fact that some of them were connected with the prayer for the abolition of Slavery in the District, they were undeniably a part of a "plan of operations," yet they were received, read and referred. Mr. Wise, of

* Of late years the trade with Haiti has been less than the average, doubtless on account of the preference given to nations that have established commercial relations. The value of this trade, as shown by the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1837, compared with that of Texas, was as follows :

IMPORTS.

From Haiti, \$1,440,856.	From Texas, \$163,384.
--------------------------	------------------------

EXPORTS.

	To Haiti.	To Texas.
Foreign Products. -	\$140,043	\$210,616
Domestic Products, -	871,938	797,628
Total, \$1,011,981		\$1,008,244

We imported more from Haiti in 1837, than from either Prussia, Sweden, and Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Portugal, Sicily, Austria Turkey, Morocco, Greece, Chili, Peru, Buenos Ayres, or than from all Africa put together. There were, indeed, but 17 countries out of the 62 mentioned in the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, from which we imported more than from Haiti.

Haiti consumes and *pays* for more of our domestic products than either Russia, Prussia, Sweden and Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Portugal, Italy, Sicily, Turkey, China, Texas, Columbia, Peru, Buenos Ayres, or all Africa.

Virginia, most emphatically expressed his mortification at being left in a bare minority of 32 in regard to the reference of one of them, after having demonstrated the Anti-Slavery character of the prayer, in the following most lucid and satisfactory manner :

“ It is proposed that we enter into commercial and treaty relations with this Republic of Haiti. Now, we send a Consul or Minister Plenipotentiary to that Republic, and they send a Minister Plenipotentiary to this Republic. And what kind of a minister will it be ! A free negro, decked out in all the paraphernalia of a Minister Plenipotentiary, rolling in all the grandeur of ministerial dignity through the streets of our Metropolis. A black Minister Plenipotentiary in the District of Columbia, surrounded by the slave states of Virginia and Maryland. I present this matter to the Representatives of the slaveholding States, and I ask them if they will permit it ? ”

Mr. Thompson of South Carolina, and Mr. Bynum of North Carolina, also very clearly stated the objections of the South to the recognition. Said the former :

“ The proposition to bring a black minister was too monstrous for discussion. If it was even attempted it would make the Constitution of this country to reel and totter like a drunken man. It would put an end to the Union at once. He was willing to make this a test question. Let those who choose discuss it. Let them come up to the scrafeh, and adopt measures for the recognition of Haiti, and we will know what to do.”

That the northern members, or as Mr. Adams appropriately termed them, the “ *servile part* ” of the House, should have fallen back from their position, and availed themselves of the letter to nullify the spirit of the gag, shows that they feel the power of the Abolitionists through the ballot-box, and are not willing to do the drudgery of slaveholders any further than they are absolutely *driven*.

No report was made, however, by the Committee of Foreign Affairs. It remains for a Congress freed, by northern freemen, from the shackles of the slaveholding faction, to do an act equally dictated by national honor and national interest.

In what tones does this opposition in Congress to a measure so safe and reasonable, proclaim the fitness of the slaves for liberty ! Their manhood is not a thing *to be made*. It is all as ready to do its work, on the least excitement, as powder is to explode at a spark. Let a black ambassador roll along the avenues of Washington, as the white ones do, and the spell of twenty-five hundred thousand fetters is broken. The peculiar institution cannot bear the sight of it—so ready are the slaves to be free.

There is indeed no end to the reproach which Slavery casts upon us among the civilized nations of the earth. The case of Mr. Stevenson and Mr. O’Connell illustrates the position. The Irish Liberator delivered an address upon the first of August in Birmingham, in which he alluded to our Ambassador as a *Breeder*

of Slaves. How our Ambassador should be ashamed of a business which is the main source of wealth in his own State, and is so honorable in the capital of his own country that its government will not treat with decency the most respectful petition for its abolition, is more than we know. Mr. Stevenson, however, felt himself deeply insulted, and resolved to have satisfaction. His first step was to despatch to Mr. O'Connell one of those laconic notes which look towards a physical combat. In the present instance the note, borne by Gen. Hamilton, the ex-Governor of South Carolina, and Captain Perry, of the United States Navy, while it was sufficiently belligerent in its form and manner, in its matter almost precluded the possibility of an actual engagement; for in a case where Mr. O'Connell's Speech was evidently mis-reported, it merely inquired whether the report published in certain papers was correct, basing its intimations of hostile proceedings not upon the fact of Mr. O'Connell's having brought the charge of slave-breeding, but the correctness of the reporter in the matter. Mr. O'Connell, whose resolution against duelling is sufficiently well known, very naturally answered that the report was not correct. This reply it suited our honorable Ambassador to treat as a retraction of the charge! In this connection, without denying that he held slaves as merchandize, he undertook to wipe off not only from himself but from his State the charge of slave-breeding for sale, as a foul aspersion. At the same time Gen. Hamilton wrote for the press in this country a letter full of that rhodomontade which passes for chivalry among slaveholders, in which he bestowed upon the champion of Irish liberty the most unmeasured abuse, and talked of "stopping his wind!"*

* To make this matter plain, we give some extracts from Mr. O'Connell's final publication on the matter, a letter to the Editor of the London Morning Chronicle. It undeniably states the truth of the case.

"In the first place, there had appeared in the *Examiner*, a report of a speech of mine at the great Birmingham meeting on the first of August, which contained the following paragraph:

• I believe their very Ambassador here, is a slave-breeder; one of those beings who rear up slaves for the purpose of traffic. Is it possible that America would send here a man who traffics in blood, and who is a disgrace to human nature? *I hope the assertion is untrue, but it is right to speak out.*"

"In the next place, Mr. Stevenson, on the 9th of August, wrote to me a letter containing a part of the above paragraph; that is, he omitted the words which I have put in italics, and which manifestly show that the report could not be accurate, as these words made it involve a direct contradiction. And thus, having ascertained that the report could not be correct, he, with the gravity of a diplomatist, put to me the single question, viz. whether the report was correct or not? It being thus impossible that he should get any other reply to that question than that the report was not correct.

That these proceedings were most disgraceful to our country, is sufficiently proved by the disapprobation which has been visited upon them even by the southern press. Our Ambassador is now understood by the people among whom he resides to have shown a disposition to murder a member of the British Parliament, for making a statement which was after all but the simple truth. Has our government recalled, or in any way rebuked the Ambassador? So far from this, when Mr. Adams has in various shapes brought before Congress, resolutions calling for an investigation

“Of course, I answered his question accordingly, namely, that the report was not correct; but I referred expressly in my reply to another report of the speech in my possession, imagining that he would, upon such reference, call for the accurate version.

“Thus far it is quite clear that no apology had been required or made. I am no duellist, and should, therefore, if asked, have stated what I really did say, abiding by it only as far as it was true, and abandoning it in any particular in which it might appear that I was mistaken.

“But as I made Mr. Stevenson no apology, he determined on making one to himself, and accordingly he wrote a second letter, and in it *presumed that I had made a disavowal of offensive expressions*. Now this was either fancy or diplomacy, I care not which; but it was as gratuitous a presumption upon *his* part, as the reality would have been unnecessary upon *mine*.

“However, as my speech *did* contain an important passage respecting the horrid traffic, which it is asserted, (I hope most untruly) Mr. Stevenson participates in, I will state the paragraph as it was accurately reported in the *Emancipation* newspaper. I do this the rather to afford Mr. Stevenson, who seems so anxious about offensive *words*, an opportunity of disavowing, if he pleases, a *thing* most offensive in the sight of man and in the presence of God.

“The real paragraph is this:

“It is asserted that their very Ambassador here is a slave-breeder; one of those beings who rear and breed up slaves merely for the purpose of traffic. Is it possible that America would send a man here who traffics in blood, and who, *if he does*, would be a disgrace to human nature? I hope the assertion is untrue; but it is right to speak out.”

“Such was the real passage in my speech. I despise duelling, and mean nothing of what is called personality; but I do hope that, as Mr. Stevenson has already rushed into print, he will give the report which I have above alluded to a distinct contradiction.

“My sole object in my speech at Birmingham, and my present object is, to rouse the attention of England and of Europe to all that is cruel, criminal, and, in every sense of the word, infamous, in the system of Negro Slavery in North America. My deliberate conviction is, that until that system is abolished, no American slaveholder ought to be received on a footing of equality by any of the civilized inhabitants of Europe. I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

“Derrynane Abbey, Sept. 13, 1838.

of the matter, they have been promptly consigned to the bondage of the table. The following are among those sets of resolutions presented by that untiring enemy of oppression.

Resolved, That a Committee of — members be appointed, with leave to send for persons and papers, to inquire and report to this House.

1. Whether Andrew Stevenson, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from the United States at London, is, or has recently been engaged in a public newspaper controversy involving his personal integrity, and the honor of his country, whose representative he is, with Daniel O'Connell, member of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

2. Whether the said Andrew Stevenson, holding the privileged character of an Ambassador, has in concert with three other persons, citizens of the United States, one of them an officer in their Navy, engaged in a conspiracy with intent to *stop the wind*, or in the language of the laws of God and of man, to murder the said Daniel O'Connell, in a duel, or by a premeditated provocation to a brawl.

3. Whether the said Andrew Stevenson, after a written demand of explanation, in the form usual among duelists, as preliminary to a challenge, and with the intent to follow it up by a challenge, preconcerted with the said three other citizens of the United States, did accept of an answer from the said Daniel O'Connell, equally unsatisfactory to the codes of genuine and of spurious honor, and thereby tacitly to admit the truth of the imputation upon his honor, at which he had professed to take offence.

4. Whether the said Andrew Stevenson, in these transactions, has violated the duties of his office as an Ambassador of peace, the laws of nations, the laws of the land, to the Government of which he was accredited, the privileges of the British House of Commons, in the person of one of its members, and the honor and interest of his own country.

5. Whether the said Andrew Stevenson has, in these transactions, so conducted himself as to require the interposition of this house, by impeachment or otherwise.

That the House of Representatives after passing the infamous resolutions which have struck down the right of petition, should apply the gag to debate whenever it approached the unlawful subject, is not surprising. There were some remarkable instances of this in the last session. Mr. Giddings, of Ohio, in giving his reasons for refusing to vote for an appropriation to erect a free bridge over the eastern branch of the Potomac, alluded to the slave-trade in the District as making it unfit for the seat of government, and making it improper that the people of the United States should be called upon for money to be expended for its further improvement. This a southern chairman of Committee of the Whole, Mr. Rencher of North Carolina, decided *to be in order*. But when Mr. Giddings began to unfold the atrocities of the slave-traffic in the District, his voice was overborne by slaveholding clamor, and the chairman was obliged to reverse his decision ! Mr. Giddings carefully abstained from any reference to slavery at large, and confined his remarks exclusively to the traffic, technically so called. Here then we see the progress of things since,

in 1815, John Randolph of Roanoke, held the following language in the same body : “ *An inhuman and disgraceful traffic in slaves was secretly carried on in the City of Washington, and if Congress would not assist him he wou’d himself ferret out the offenders at the expense of his own private fortune.* ”

Then these enormities were practised in *secret* and the *ferreting out* of such offences was heard with respect. Now the business is done openly, and no member of the body under whose exclusive legislation it is done, must allude to it in debate. Even so late as 1828, a bill was reported, though not acted upon, for the suppression of this trade in the “ bodies and souls of men.” It has since prospered beyond all precedent. Regular slave packets are established, and run semi-monthly during the greater part of the year, between the District and New Orleans. Chained coffles, for exportation, are shamelessly driven along the avenues that bear the names of free states. The representatives of these states are overwhelmed with clamor and gagged down by decisions of the chair, if they have the courage to speak of the matter. And when we are asked by foreigners, Has not your Congress declared the foreign slave-trade piracy ? we are obliged to reply, Yes ;—Has it not the same power over the same trade within its own territorial limits ? Yes ;—Is not your country then guilty of piracy—implicated from head to foot in the sin of the Barbary States ? Yes.

During this very session a chained coffle was impudently driven by the very steps of the capital, and might, for aught we know, have jostled some of the honorable members as they passed to and fro. Mr. Slade took occasion to put to the House of Representatives the question, BY WHAT AUTHORITY those men were so driven. **THEY COULD NOT TELL!!** They dared not. These men had been guilty of no CRIME. The Constitution guarantees to the people of the United States that so far as the legislation of the Federal Government is concerned, “ no man shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law”—and in the District of Columbia Congress has the whole power of legislation. These men had never been tried on any accusation—their liberty had been taken from them *without* due process of law—without *any* process whatever.

If there is any thing which, more than what we have already said, shows that in our country the will of slaveholders is every thing, and the will of freemen nothing, it is the present attitude of the candidates for the presidency.

Mr. Van Buren, who is doubtless expected to receive the votes of his party for a second term, is not without reason gloried in at the South as a “ northern man with southern principles.” His

pledge of a *veto* in favor of slavery and the slave-trade in the District, his casting vote in favor of Mr. Calhoun's bill of abominations —making ten thousand deputy postmasters censors of the press under *state laws*; his undoubted approval of the last gag, a measure of which *his* party stole the honor, and his late restoration to the Colonization Society of the support formerly afforded by the National Government ostensibly for the benefit of re-captured Africans, leave no more doubt of his thorough subserviency to the slaveholders, than his present position does of the *price* which they have paid him for it.

The Whig party, as it styles itself, has not yet formally selected its candidate. A convention is to be held for that purpose in December next. Numerous primary meetings at the South have nominated Henry Clay, and resolved to support his claims in the convention. Equally numerous meetings at the North have made no nomination, but resolved, blindfold, to abide by the decision of the *Convention*. This, notwithstanding the nomination of Mr. Garrison by a portion of the Whig party, makes it highly probable that Henry Clay will be the choice of the Whig Convention.

His own efforts have not been wanting to put his popularity at the South on a par with that of Mr. Van Buren. We do not intend to adjudge the palm of infamy between these two rival politicians, both of whom, prostrate before the power that has ruled us with a rod of iron, are striving to outdo each other in licking the dust from its footstool. The claims of Mr. Van Buren are well understood by all who read and reason. We shall more particularly unfold those of Mr. Clay.

Henry Clay enjoys a high reputation as an orator and a statesman, both at home and abroad. His eloquence in favor of Greek and South American liberty, and of North American liberty *in the abstract*, has often thrilled the United States from Georgia to Maine. On the subject of slavery he has always adopted a language which could be made to harmonise with our northern prejudices, in favor of liberty, and in opposition to the colored man. The unrelenting owner of slaves, he has been from the first the patron saint and is now the President of the Colonization Society—a Society which he has always recommended to the South as tending to enhance, rather than to diminish, the value of slave property, and to the North as affording, through the separation of the races, the only hope of the abolition of slavery. To his statesmanship the country owes that base compromise by which the North gave up to interminable slavery all the territory of the Union south of $36^{\circ} 30'$ north latitude. He had the art to make many at the North to believe, that, by this compromise, they gained or secured something for liberty, whereas the gain was all on the other side. But all this would not satisfy the South.

They wanted words as well as actions. Accordingly, in the last session, Mr. Clay, as it is said and not denied, procured a petition to be got up in the District of Columbia, praying that no petitions relating to slavery in that District, should be treated with respect, except their own. In presenting this petition, Mr. Clay took occasion fully to develope his views and position in regard to the right of petition and slavery. He finds fault with the gag resolutions, *not* as a violation of the right of petition, but as impolitic, giving Abolitionists the opportunity to gain sympathy, as if their rights were abridged. He proclaims the absolute right of *property* in slaves, that is, that they are as much the property of their masters, as their horses or their dogs—that property is the creation of law—and that any thing whatsoever which the *law* declares *to be* property, is property. According to this view, he claims that the abolition of slavery would be unjust unless the free states should pay to the slave states the sum of TWELVE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS, which he estimates to be the value of the slaves in cash. He declares that the two races cannot live together under a system of equitable laws, but that the blacks if freed would immediately seek to gain the political ascendancy over their former masters—yet he now gives it up that “no practical scheme, for their removal or separation from us, has yet been devised.” Consequently, he now limits his love of liberty, which he calls his Maker to witness even now thrills with every pulsation of his heart, to the work of regretting that it pleased Providence to place the two races together, while his love of slavery goes fully to *eternize* their present relation! If there is such a thing as political blasphemy, it is contained in the speech of Mr. Clay. It is sufficient to add, that Mr. Calhoun, the professed advocate of slavery as the natural and appropriate condition of THE LABORER, greeted Mr. Clay at its close as having dealt a death-blow to abolition.

Where is the man who will consent that the government of his country shall be administered by either of these men? That man is politically a slave—he is the slave of slavery.

The Hon. Thomas Morris most ably and eloquently sustained the cause of liberty in the Senate, and he was the only man who showed any disposition to do so, in reply to Mr. Clay. He was to the Senate what Abolitionists are to the country,—a voice which they cannot but hear and must respect. Let any candid man—let any disinterested foreigner, read the two speeches, and we are confident he will say, that in moral power—that power which after all will prevail,—Thomas Morris, alone, was stronger than Henry Clay with the whole Senate—infinitely stronger.

In view of this subject, the Committee would solemnly inquire,

whether it is not time for every man who regards the eternal laws of right and wrong, which God has imposed upon the moral universe, to cast off the cords which slavery has thrown around us all, whether they be political or ecclesiastical. Let us contribute our political strength to the election of only those men who will use the constitutional power of their respective offices to bring slavery to an end, and to raise up our poor country from the mire of infamy in which she is sunk. In regard to the President, we may not succeed this term or the next, but succeed we ultimately must if we now seize the right principle and persevere. Is it not also time to insist on *an alteration of the Constitution of these United States?* Shall we not now at length use the constitutional means to make the Constitution what it should have been at first? In proposing an alteration of the Constitution, this Committee would not be understood to recommend an alteration of our plan of government—clothing the general government with new powers at the expense of the States—but simply such a change in the organic law of the Union, that the States shall be obliged to extinguish slavery by the power which they already possess. History will yet bestow the richly deserved meed of honor to the noble statesman who, at the last session, proposed such an alteration.* Much as we regret that Mr. Adams should

MONDAY, Feb. 25.

* Mr. Adams asked leave to present the following resolutions, which were read for information:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, two-thirds of both Houses concurring therein, That the following amendments to the Constitution of the United States be proposed to the several States of the Union; which, when ratified by three-fourths of the Legislatures of said States, shall become and be a part of the Constitution of the United States.

1st. From and after the 4th day of July, 1842, there shall be, throughout the United States, no hereditary slavery; but on and after that day every child born within the United States, their Territories or jurisdiction, shall be born free.

2nd. With the exception of the Territory of Florida, there shall henceforth never be admitted into this Union any State, the Constitution of which shall tolerate within the same the existence of slavery.

3d. From and after the 4th of July, 1845, there shall be neither slavery nor slave trade at the seat of Government of the United States.

Objection having been made,

Mr. A. proceeded to state that he had in his possession a petition which he desired to present, and on which these resolutions were founded. It was a petition from John Jay and 43 most respectable citizens of the city of New-York.

[Mr. A. was here interrupted by cries to order.]

And the Speaker having decided that the motion to suspend the rule must first be disposed of,

Mr. A. did not press the motion further at this time.

The letter-writer of the New-York American says of Mr. Adams:

"At this startling proposition, the southern members opened their mouths in astonishment. They considered that Mr. A. had been effectually subdued by

not agree with us in urging Congress to use its acknowledged power for the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and much as we regret that he should have incorporated the idea of *gradualism* in his proposed alteration of the Constitution, we cannot withhold our thanks from the man who, after thwarting the potent Texas conspiracy, has held on in the brunt of the battle, and now at last under the threats of assassination of the infuriated and alarmed slaveholders, has dared to face the threat of "dissolution." The proposition of Mr. Adams is virtually a resolution of things into their original elements. It brings back the slavery question, at least, where it stood in 1787, and disposes of it not as Immediate Abolitionists would be glad to, but as our fathers doubtless would have done, had they trusted a little less to the unwritten pledges of the South. To us it seems, that Mr. Adams' proposition would have gained every thing, in point of moral power, while it would have lost nothing in point of feasibility, had it adopted the *immediate emancipation* instead of the *post nati* principle. With the light of West Indian liberty pouring down upon us like a summer's sun—and the volcanic groans of our own prison-house in our ears, it is no time to talk of any thing with slaveholders but *immediate justice*, and as full as the nature of man, and the great social crime by which he has been dethroned, will admit. Let us come to the doors of the next Congress, not with half a million of names for justice in the District of Columbia, but with a million for that and for the PROPOSAL OF AMENDMENTS, by which every vestige of slavery shall be wiped out, not only from the Constitution but from the face of this nation.

the 'threatening letters,' and that his recent explanation was the result of fear; they were therefore taken by surprise at his movement this morning in adhering to his former principles, and that the 'old scoundrel,' as they term him, was firm as ever."





